THE Righteouſneſs of God Revealed in the GOSPEL.

OR,

An IMPARTIAL ENQUIRY into the Genuine Doctrine of St. *PAUL*, In the Great, but much Controverted ARTICLE of JUSTIFICATION.

By Mr. JOHN HUMFREY.

Of making Books there is no End; and much Study is a Wearineſs to the Fleſh. Let us hear the Concluſion of the Matter, Fear God and keep his Commandments for this is the whole of Man, Ec. 12. 13, 14.

LONDON, Printed for *T. Parkhurſt* at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns* in *Cheapſide*, 1697.

(12), 57, (2) p

TO THE

READER.

HAVING ſeriouſly read this Treatiſe concerning the *Juſtification of a Sinner*, I found ſo clear and diſtinct an Account given of it, that, as it gave me no ſmall Satisfaction, ſo I could not but think it worthy to be peruſed by others. For though the Learned Author departs, in ſome things, from the common Opinion, yet he doth it ſo modeſtly, that candid Perſons, though contrary minded, will not blame him for it: And his Reaſons are ſuch, that it is poſſible they may be convinced by them, and perſwaded to embrace his Explication of this weighty Doctrine.

However, his Drift and Intention is ſo evidently Holy, [*viz.* to prevent Mens falling into the moſt dangerous Errors] that he may hope for their Pardon, who think him not to be altogether in the Right himſelf. For as to the main Buſineſs, no Man more ſtrenuouſly aſſerts the Doctrine of our Church, of *Juſtification by Faith only*; accor- to the Explication which is made of it in our *Homilies* (in the Second Part of *the Sermon of Salvation*) in theſe Words.

This

To the READER.

This Saying, That we be juſtified by Faith only, freely and without Works, is ſpoken for to take away clearly all Merit of our Works; as being unable to deſerve our Juſtification at God's Hands: And thereby moſt plainly to expreſs the Weakneſs of Man, and the Goodneſs of God; the great Infirmity of our ſelves and the Might and Power of God; the Imperfectneſs of our own Works, and the moſt abundant Grace of our Saviour Chriſt; and therefore wholy to aſcribe the Merit and deſerving of our Juſtification, unto Chriſt only, and his moſt pretious Blood-ſhedding.

But although this Doctrine be never ſo true (as it there follows) *that we be juſtified freely, without all Merit of our own Good Works* (*as St.* Paul *doth expreſs it*) *and freely by this lively and perfect Faith in Chriſt only* (*as the ancient Authors uſe to ſpeak it*) *yet this true Doctrine muſt be alſo truly underſtood, and moſt plainly declared; leſt carnal Men ſhould take unjuſtly occaſion thereby to live carnally, after the appetite and will of the World, the Fleſh and the Devil.*

Now this being the very Scope of this Author, *to declare the right Underſtanding* of this Doctrine, ſo plainly that no Man may thereby take any Occaſion of Carnal Liberty; he hopes his Endeavour will be acceptable to all thoſe *that love the Lord Jeſus in Sincerity.* Amen.

Nov. 24. 1696.

SY. ELIENS.

Worceſter, Apr. 7. 1697.

SIR,

THE *Papers you were pleaſed to ſend me I have carefully peruſed; and I am not without Hopes, that through the Bleſſing of God, they may allay thoſe unreaſonable Heats, which have made ſo great a Noiſe, about the Point of Juſtification: and yet we are told, that they all agree in the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction, and the Covenant of Grace, as founded upon it. But we find by too common Experience, that it is poſſible for Men upon their own Miſtakes to grow as warm in this Matter, as if they were diſputing with the* Jews, *as St.* Paul *did in his Epiſtle to the* Romans. *But if ſuch Perſons would lay aſide Prejudices, and Impartially conſider the State of the Caſe at that Time, they would far better underſtand this Controverſy, and not think ſo hardly of their Brethren.*

For, nothing can be plainer to me, than that St. Paul *oppoſes that which he calls,* The Righteouſneſs of God by Faith, *to* their own Righteouſneſs, *which was* by the Law: *And* which made the Reward not of Grace, but of Debt. *And* Faith *is taken by him as a Term oppoſite to* the Law, *and importing the Grace of the Goſpel;* Therefore it is of Faith that it might be of Grace. *So that Juſtification by Faith is in other Words, being juſtified by the Grace of the Goſpel, manifeſted by the Doctrine of Chriſt, and procured by his Sufferings: which are granted, both by them and us, to be the* only meritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification. *The remaining Diſpute then, can only be concerning thoſe Terms on which we may be made Partakers of this Grace of the Goſpel, which is communicated to Mankind, as the Effect of Chriſt's Satisfaction. Which is very different from that which St.* Paul *managed, againſt all ſuch as ſet up their own Works (whether according to the Law of Nature, or of* Moſes) *againſt the Goſpel of Chriſt, and thought there was no neceſſity of any ſuch Propitiation by Chriſt, as St. Paul aſſerted, in order to the Remiſſion of Sins and the Favour of God. For, the Jews believed, that* the Righteouſneſs of the Law, *as it was performed by them, was ſufficient in order to their Acceptance with God; and that there was ſuch a Proportion between their Works and the Favour of God, as made it a Debt of Juſtice. Which Opinion remains among them to this Day, as appears by this Saying of* Manaſſeh Ben-Iſrael, Hinc meritis Gratiam Dei acquiri non eſt Dubitandam. *By which it ſeems, that the Jews have not alter'd their Opinions ſince the Apoſtles Days; but all that underſtand*

Rom. 1. 17. 3. 21. 10. 3. Phil. 3. 9. Rom. 3. 27, 28. 4. 15.

Christianity aright, do agree, that there is no other meritorious Cause of our Acceptance with God, but the Propitiation which Christ hath made. In whom we have Redemption through his Blood, even the Forgiveneſs of Sins. And not by Works of Righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his Mercy he ſaved us; that being juſtified by his Grace, we ſhould be made Heirs according to the Hope of Eternal Life.

Coloſ. 1. 14. Titus 3. 5, 6.

But here comes the material Queſtion to be reſolved; How we come to receive the Benefits of Chriſt's Sufferings?

To anſwer this Diſtinctly, we muſt conſider them Two Ways:

1. *As they reſpect Mankind, or thoſe in General for whom Chriſt died.*

2. *As they belong to Particular Perſons.*

The former are thoſe Benefits which reſult from God's Acceptance of Chriſt's Sacrifice on behalf of Mankind; which the Apoſtle calls, God's being in Chriſt, reconciling the World to himſelf, not imputing their Treſpaſſes unto them: *If this be meant of actual Pardon, then all the Sins of the World are* not imputed *upon Chriſt's Death, without any Act on their Parts; and ſo the Miniſtry of Reconciliation would be to no purpoſe; which the Apoſtle immediately adds,* was committed to them. *To what End, if the Sins of the World were already forgiven? But the Apoſtle ſaith, v. 20. That it was to perſwade Men* to be reconciled to God: i. e. *to believe and repent and obey the Goſpel. For what Reaſon? If not, that thereby they might actually partake of theſe general Benefits which ariſe from that Reconciliation Chriſt hath made by his Death? Which can ſuppoſe no Conditions in us, being the immediate Effects of Chriſt's Propitiation, and muſt be diſtinguiſhed from what follows, Reconciliation on our Parts.*

2 Cor. 5. 19.

But as to the Particular Effects, belonging to ſome Perſons, as diſtinguiſhed from others, the Queſtion ariſes, Whether God out of his infinite Goodneſs, do beſtow them on thoſe whom he deſigns for Happineſs without regard to any Act of theirs? Or whether by the Goſpel, he hath limited the Conveyance of them to the Performance of certain Conditions? There is no Queſtion, but that if nothing but Freeneſs of Grace be to be look'd at, that is much freer, which requires no Conditions, nor expects any: But if they be expected, whether out of Gratitude, or otherwiſe, they are real Conditions as to the End. But we are to look not only to the Freeneſs of God's Grace, (which no doubt was the Foundation of the Covenant of Grace) but to the Author, *and to the* Terms *of it.*

The

The Author *of it is God himſelf, who out of his Infinite Goodneſs hath ſent his Son to be a Propitiation for our Sins; and we cannot ſuppoſe any Covenant made by him to be repugnant to the Perfections of the Divine Nature. Now, Holineſs and Righteouſneſs are eſſential Attributes of God; and any ſuch Covenant, which in the Conſequence of it, overthrows the Rules of Righteouſneſs and Holineſs, muſt be look'd on, as contrary to the Pure and Holy Nature of God. But ſuch a Covenant as conſiſts only in abſolute Promiſes (if it can be called a Covenant) muſt ſuperſede any Obligation on Man's Part to any Duty, as a Condition of enjoying the Benefit of thoſe Promiſes; and conſequently overthrow the Rules of Righteouſneſs. But* the Righteous Lord loveth Righteouſneſs. And he that doth Righteouſneſs is Righteous, even as he is Righteous. *How is it then poſſible to conceive, that God ſhould make ſuch a Covenant of Grace with Mankind, as ſhould have no regard to the Practiſe of real Righteouſneſs? And this Suppoſition muſt leſſen our eſteem of the Divine Nature and Perfections, overthrow the Deſign of Religion, and make God a Reſpecter of Perſons, by taking no Notice of their inward Qualities and Diſpoſitions.*

Pſal. 11. 7. 1 *John* 3. 7.

Which are things of ſuch dangerous Conſequence, that I can hardly believe that any who pretend to love the Lord Jeſus Chriſt in Sincerity ſhould entertain ſuch Principles, from whence they do too naturally follow. For, if any Perſon ſhould make it his Buſineſs to render Chriſtianity ſuſpected, as a Deſign to Promote Libertiniſm, under a Pretence of advancing Free Grace, he could not make uſe of any Hypotheſis more effectual than this; That God requires no Conditions in order to the Benefit of his Promiſes. But to ſuppoſe that God is ſo Gracious, as to forgive the Sins of truly humble and penitent Sinners, who reſolve by the Grace of God to depart from Iniquity, and to live as becomes the Goſpel, is ſo far from any Incongruity to the Divine Nature, that it tends more to advance our Apprehenſions of God's Goodneſs joyned with his Wiſdom and Holineſs; and ſo brings Mankind to a due Love of God, and a Hatred of Sin.

As to the Terms *of this Covenant, I think it not poſſible for any unprejudiced Perſon to read the New Teſtament, and not to ſee, that it ſtill ſuppoſes Conditions on our parts, to make us Partakers of the Benefit of Chriſt's Sufferings. But it is poſſible for Men to be ſo fond of a particular Opinion, which they have before taken up, that they may accommodate all places to that darling Notion; I mean as to the abſolute freeneſs of God's Grace. Which, if it be purſued, muſt*

overthrow as well the Satisfaction of Christ, as the Conditions on our Part.

But here lies the great Difficulty; How can we be justified without a perfect Righteousness? And our own Performances at the best make but an imperfect Righteousness; and therefore the perfect Righteousness of Christ must be imputed to us: And if a perfect Righteousness be made ours, what need can there be of an imperfect Righteousness to be joined for our Justification?

This is the Force of all the Reasoning I have met with about this Matter, to which I shall give a plain and distinct Answer:

1. *I am far from disowning the Righteousness of Christ to have been a perfect Righteousness; or that it is the only meritorious Cause of our Justification. Or, to speak plainer, I do freely own the Satisfaction of Christ to be the Foundation of the Covenant of Grace, by Vertue whereof we are justified.*

2. *That to be justified is to be put into a State of Grace and Favour with God. I do not mean, that we are justified by* Inherent Righteousness; i. e. *that God justifies when he gives Grace; but that upon our sincere performance of the Conditions on our part, God receives us into a State of Favour or Grace. And so deals with us as with righteous Persons; and not meerly declares us to be such. For although the Word* Justifying *be often used as a Forensick Word, or a Law Term, and so is opposed to Condemning; yet that Use is not to be pressed too far: because it will inclose us in many Difficulties about the Tribunal, the Law, the Plea, the judicial Act, and the several Causes,* Material *and* Formal, &c. *all which, I think, tend more to darken than to clear this Point of Justification, which ought to be kept out of School Terms and Logical Nicetias, as much as possible; since St.* Paul *did not speak according to them in this Matter. For so* Adoption *is Originally a Law Term used likewise by St.* Paul, *and it would be hard straining to bring* Adoption *to all the Formalities of the Roman Law.*

If we look into the Design of St. Paul, *we shall find it was to state the true Ground of our Acceptance with God; which he shews could not be from any thing Mankind were able of themselves to perform in obedience to the Law, because they were under guilt, and could never clear themselves from it. But* God hath set forth his Son to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, to declare his Righteousness for the Remission of Sins, *&c.* To declare at this time his Righteousness, that he might be Just and the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

Rom. 3 25, 26.

So

So that here we have the Foundation or Meritorious Cauſe, the Propitiation of Chriſt; *the Goodneſs of God in accepting this Propitiation in order to* Remiſſion *and* Juſtification; *and the way we come to partake of it* by Faith in Chriſt; *as it imbraces theſe Offers, and carries along with it thoſe ſincere Endeavours obeying the Goſpel, which God accepts as our Evangelical Righteouſneſs. But to* be Juſtified *in St.* Paul's *Senſe, is to be admitted into the Grace and Favour of God on thoſe Terms; and ſo it doth not lie barely in Remiſſion of Sins, which is rather the Conſequence of this Acceptance with God.* Therefore we conclude, that a Man is juſtified by Faith, without the Deeds of the Law; i. e. *A Man is received into the Favour of God, not by his own Works, but according to the Grace of the Goſpel, and the Terms contained therein. And this I take to be St.* Paul's *meaning.* Rom. 3. 28.

3. *The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt may be ſaid to be imputed two ways.*

1. *So as it becomes our Perſonal Righteouſneſs, which is called Formal Imputation.*

2. *So as the Benefit of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs and Satisfaction, redounds to our Advantage.*

If the former Senſe be allowed, theſe Conſequences follow:

1. *That we muſt be as Righteous as Chriſt was; for, if Perſonal Righteouſneſs can be transferred, the Perſon on whom it is transferred, muſt have that very Righteouſneſs which was in Chriſt himſelf; and ſo muſt be as Holy and Innocent as he was; which I hardly think any will pretend to.*

2. *That there can be no Remiſſion of Sin, as to ſuch who have this perfect Righteouſneſs, no more than there could be to Chriſt himſelf; Imputation for* Remiſſion *of Sin, and of Perſonal Righteouſneſs are inconſiſtent: For the one muſt ſuppoſe Guilt, and the other cannot; when the Perſonal Righteouſneſs is actually imputed. There may be antecedent Guilt before the Imputation; but where there is perfect Righteouſneſs actually imputed, there can be no perſonal Guilt; for if there be, it can be no perfect Righteouſneſs as to him.*

3. *That there can be no Conditions required, where a perfect Righteouſneſs is imputed. For a Condition is in order to ſomething to be obtained; but here the full Benefit is already received by the Imputation of a perfect Righteouſneſs; and it is abſurd to ſuppoſe Conditions for the obtaining of what is paſt. It cannot then be denied, that thoſe ſpeak conſonantly enough to this Hypotheſis, who exclude all Conditions from the new Covenant; but very dangerouſly as to the Deſign of Charity; ſince our Saviour himſelf bids us to pray to God to forgive*

our

our Treſpaſſes, as we forgive others; which I think ſuppoſes a Condition on our Parts in order to Remiſſion. But if no more be meant by Imputation *of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, but that the Sufferings of Chriſt were in our ſtead, and for our Advantage as to Remiſſion and Juſtification, I do moſt heartily and freely own it.*

4. *The Apoſtles Argument againſt* Merit *and* Boaſting, *do by no means hold againſt ſuch an Evangelical Righteouſneſs as comes from the Grace of God, and tends wholly to the Honour of it: which is ſo clear that I need not to prove it.*

This is a ſhort Account of my Thoughts in this Matter; and I think we do not differ in the Subſtance, however we may in the manner of Explication. I am Your Friend and Servant,

E D. W I G O R N.

Mr. *Humfrey*, *Cheſter, Apr.* 12. 1997.

I Receiv'd by Piece-meal, as it came from the Preſs all your Book entituled, *Of the Righteouſneſs of God in the Matter of Juſtification* (except the Title Page and the Epiſtle) which I read over, as it came to my Hands, with Pleaſure and Profit. The great Doctrine of Juſtification, is by you ſtated more agreeably to the Scriptures, than I have met with it, in any other Author. You do, I confeſs, in ſome Places expreſs your Senſe obſcurely, ſo that it may perhaps be miſtaken by unwary Readers: but if in thoſe Places I rightly apprehend your Meaning, I do not at preſent remember any thing I have to object againſt it. However, I intend the next Week to read over the whole together, and if any Objections ſhall then occur to my Thoughts, you ſhall hear further from me. It will, I doubt not, be a good Antidote againſt the *Antinomian* Doctrines, which ſome Perſons who decry, do implicitly and by neceſſary Conſequence aſſert, by the falſe Notion they have entertain'd of Chriſt's imputed Righteouſneſs. I am *S I R*,

Your Affectionate Brother,

N. CESTRIENS.

An ADVERTISEMENT *from the* Author.

READER,

TO make a ſtay to camulate more Teſtimony to this Book, though of the like Right Reverend Perſons, to no other end but to ſignify their Conſent or Approbation of it, might give thee Occaſion to cenſure me for a ſeeker of vain Glory (which does little become ſuch a one as I) rather than thy Edification. I will uſe this ſpare Leafe therefore to another Purpoſe.

When I reprinted my Middle way of Juſtification *which I printed at firſt about 25 Years ago, I thought of writing no more on that Point: But after a while, there being ſomething I conceived needful for* Finiſhing *my* Work, *I took occaſion from the Difference among our* United Brethren, *in a ſingle Sheet, called, my* [One Sheet] *to draw up a Concluſion of the whole Matter, ſo thorowly (as I could) to my own Mind, intending it for my laſt, that I cannot think fit this Book, being now later, and like to be canvaſed more than the other, ſhould come abroad without it, as the Subſtance of this, as well as that Book before, and that I have wrote between, or any elſe I can write on this Subject. Having therefore this little room to fill, I cannot conſult my* Own Content *and* Thy *Profit better than to do it with this Citation from thence, as follows:*

To underſtand aright St. Paul's Juſtification by Faith, *we muſt conſider with whom it is he contends. The* Jews (*as the beſt skill'd in* Rabbinical *Learning, does tell us) did generally maintain the Doctrine of* Freewill, *not doubting but every one could do as God commanded if he would himſelf *, they having no Notion* (*as* Pelagius *at firſt*) *of* Grace [All that God hath ſpoken we will do]: *And having receiv'd the* Law *from God's Mouth, (the* Excellency *whereof was their Glory) they ſuppoſed in the obſervation of the* Outſide, *that they kept it, accounting the Reward promiſed therein due to them thereupon from God, as what in Juſtice they merited for their Deeds: Inſomuch that* ſome *thought themſelves ſo righteous as not to ſin at all, or need Pardon* [Touching the Law, blameleſs. All theſe have I kept from my youth up]; *and* others

* *This is the meaning of that Jewiſh ſaying,* All things are in the Power and diſpoſal of Heaven, except the Fear of God; *for that they believed was in their own.*

others *that ſinned, being lick'd whole by* Sacrifice, *they thought all well, boaſting themſelves as the* Only People, *the* Only Righteous *in the Earth. Not to mention what we all know out of the Acts, that ſome of them were Converts to Chriſtianity did yet remain of the Opinion, that their Law was to be kept. The Apoſtle now ſets himſelf againſt* † theſe Jews, *and lets them know that no Man, neither* Jew *nor* Gentile is righteous in God's ſight (*whatſoever they were in their* own) *but that* all have ſinned, *and need that* Meſſias *they expected, to* make Reconciliation *for their Sins; that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt being that true* Meſſias, *by his Death anſwering their Legal Sacrifices, hath born the Curſe of the* Law, *and ſo redeemed us from it. That, God's undeſerved Goodneſs here, in accepting of Sinners, through this meritorious Sacrifice of his, to Pardon and Life, upon Condition, which he gives the Grace alſo to perform, preſuppoſed, and by me acknowledg'd, it is another* Righteouſneſs, *and not that of the* Jews (*Not that* Paul *calls his* own, *as a* Jew), *or not a Righteouſneſs of* Works [*Perfect Works*], *but a Righteouſneſs of* Faith, *which makes the Reward only of Grace* [Of Faith, that it may be of Grace]; *a Righteouſneſs of Faith, but a* true *Faith* working by Love, *(which is an* Internal *Righteouſneſs though imperfect, and not as the* External Works *of the* Jews *was) is that* Righteouſneſs of God *in oppoſition to the Terms of the Law, whereby we are juſtified and ſaved.*

† *Not that this great Doctrine was for Confutation only of the Jew (that is a low and unworthy conceit) but for the Life and Inſtruction of Mankind: So that Juſtification by* Faith *in Oppoſition to the* Law *muſt not be underſtood as to that of Moſes only, but to the whole* Law of Works.

The Apoſtle (I obſerve) in one place ſpeaking of Faith, *calls it* the Obedience of Faith; *the ſame Word, if you compare that* Text [Rom. 11. 30, 31.] *with the* Margin, *ſignifying both to* Believe *and* Obey. And the People believed God and his Servant *Moſes. I will conclude hereupon, that Chriſt's Redemption in the immediate fruit thereof, which is the Grant of a General Pardon through his Satisfaction to all the World on Condition, being laid as a foundation, To be juſtified by Faith is to be juſtified by performing that Condition. To be juſtified by Faith (Believe me at parting) is in St.* Paul's *Mind to be juſtified by the* Obedience *of* Faith, *in oppoſition to the task of the* Law; *that is (in St.* Paul's *Mind I ſay, oppoſing the* Jew) *by embracing the Chriſtian Religion, and living according to it.*

Reader, In p. 14. l. 34. correct the Word [*its*] and make it [*it*] with a Full Point after. Other *Errataes* you may find at the end of the Book, or mend your ſelf.

O F

OF THE

Righteouſneſs of GOD

In the Matter of

JUSTIFICATION.

The Firſt PART.

BEcauſe upon the right Underſtanding of what the Apoſtle means, by the *Righteouſneſs of God without the Law, revealed* now in the Goſpel, (which indeed is dark, and hardly underſtood (I think) by *Papiſt*, or *Proteſtant*, in their Diſputes, and much leſs by our Brethren in their preſent Differences) does depend the Elucidation of the Great Article of *Juſtification*; whereof I wrote ſome Sheets formerly, called, *The Middle Way*; and more lately, ſix Sheets, called, *Pacification*; I have thought good yet to write a few more, upon ſome further increaſe of my own Knowledge about this *Subject*: And under this *Title*. I beſeech God for his Light and Truth, and for Integrity of Heart, and Pardon of my Weakneſs and Failings for my ſelf; and for the removal of Prejudice from, and the eſtabliſhing the Judgment of, others, who ſhall read what is written.

The Search after Truth is indeed hard Work, it is digging in a *Mine*: It was ſo to me, in writing on this Point at firſt, and it is ſtill. What I dig up, is but rude, it is the *Ore*, as it comes naturally; and that is beſt to edifie thoſe that would improve it. I am one whoſe Genius is averſe from any Notion impoſed, and receives none, without diſtruſt, that does not ariſe firſt out of my own Mind, or that I ſee ſomething *new* to cultivate it. I do

not only bear with others, but do like them often better that they differ from me, becauſe I know I differ from the moſt. Where the *Mine* though is *Gold*, (as the Scripture is) there is no *Duſt* of it but muſt be ſaved. The leaſt Duſt of Gold is Gold; and if any other, who hath better Words and Parts, will be at the pains to ſift and order what I have digged, I doubt not, but they may make Gold of that, which I have brought to be but the Duſt of Gold. When a Book is ſo Methodized, as it does exhauſt its Subject, there is no coming after it: But when there is only ſome *Ore* turn'd up, ſomething of Notion for others to refine, a riper Wit will be encouraged to an Endeavour of bringing that Something to more perfection. It is ſo with my *Middle-Way* Books, I am content to be but the *Digger*, I expect ſome others ſhould be the *Refiners* of what I have digged.

The *Trent Doctrine*, (which is the perfect Papiſts) I muſt confeſs, is lead them by St. *Auſtine*. They ſay, Juſtification is the making a Man juſt (*Ex impio Chriſtianum*) by Infuſion of Grace inherent, or Charity: *Being juſtified freely by his Grace*. *Auguſtine* being immerſed in his Diſpute with *Pelagius*, could think of *Grace* in no Sence but this; and by *Freely*, *Gratis*, juſtified, he underſtood only, that Works preparatory did not merit this infuſion, which the *Trent*-Doctors alſo ſay after him. The *Efficient* Cauſe (*quæ efficit*) is the *Spirit*; the *Inſtrumental* Cauſe (*qua efficitur*) *Baptiſm*; the *Meritorious* Cauſe (*propter quam*) *Chriſt's Death*; the *Formal* Cauſe (*per quam*) of Juſtification, is this Grace infuſed; *Gratia Habitualis*, Habitual Righteouſneſs, making the Man before *ungodly*, now righteous in God's ſight. This habitual Righteouſneſs then being infuſed by Baptiſm, (they ſay) does aboliſh Sin, ſo that there remains in the Baptized, after the *Opus Operatum*, nothing that is *Peccatum*, (but *Fomes Peccati* only) and upon that Account is *perfect*, ſo by the Law juſtifies, and the Works proceeding from it, *meritorious* of Salvation. This is their Opinion, and they fall foul on us for holding Juſtification by Pardon only, or by Chriſt without inherent Grace, as if Good Works were laid aſide by us altogether.

Our Proteſtants therefore renouncing this Charge, do grant an habitual Righteouſneſs, or Grace infuſed, as neceſſary in the juſtified Perſon, but deny this Righteouſneſs to be that which juſtifies him, they deny *Juſtification* to be *Regeneration*, and diſtinguiſh theſe as two things. It is not this inherent Righteouſneſs, (ſay they) that can be oppoſed between the Wrath of God, and

our

our Conſcience of Sin, to be the Cauſe, *Propter quam*, we are not condemned. No, there is a Righteouſneſs (they add) without us, that is the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt performed for us, and by our Faith made ours, that we rely upon to do this for us. Our inherent Grace is inchoate, imperfect, and cannot ſtand in Judgment before God.

This being now partly well on both ſides, there is a *Middle Way* appears, which we muſt take between them. It is true againſt the Papiſts, that there is no ſuch Righteouſneſs inherent, though infuſed by the Holy Spirit, as does aboliſh Sin, and make us ſo juſt that we can oppoſe it to God's Wrath, ſo as to render him appeaſed with the Sinner, or that the Conſcience can reſt on it, as that *Propter quod*, he is forgiven or ſaved: It is true likewiſe, againſt the common Proteſtant that there is not any Righteouſneſs without us, that can be made ours, ſo as we ſhould be accounted righteous in another's Righteouſneſs, and to be that thing, *Per quod*, we are juſtified. There is no ſuch Matter in reality, but in notion only. When one Man is juſtified, and not another, ſomething there muſt be in the one, that is not in the other. This Righteouſneſs now, whatſoever it be, as imperfect as it is (confeſſedly yet, wrought by the Spirit of God) is that, and muſt be that, which is the Form, *per quam*, he is accepted, or juſtified, when the Satisfaction, and the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, we all (at leaſt Proteſtants) do grant to be the Ground, or Reaſon of that Acceptation; that is, the Meritorious Cauſe, *propter quam*, we are pardoned and ſaved.

It is not therefore the *Papiſts* infuſed perfect Righteouſneſs, (for there is no ſuch;) nor the *Proteſtants* imputed Righteouſneſs (for that is not *ours*) both of which anſwer the *Law*, if we could plead *them*, and would make the *Reward of Debt*: But it is a Third Thing, *The Righteouſneſs of God without the Law*, as the Apoſtle calls it, a Righteouſneſs now *revealed* in the Goſpel, in oppoſition to *Works* (that is meritorious, perfect Works) which we have and muſt have, and yet anſwer not the Law, but makes our Juſtification therefore of Mercy, or Grace, which is the *Righteouſneſs* (as yet quite out of ſight of the moſt) we muſt advance (*Paulo Duce*) in the Doctrine of Juſtification.

In one Verſe of *David*'s Pſalms, we have him praying thus: *Hear my Prayer, O Lord, anſwer me in thy Righteouſneſs.* Where we ſee a Righteouſneſs of God, according to which he is accepted: And yet in the next Verſe do theſe Words follow: *And*

enter not into Judgment with thy Servant: for in thy ſight ſhall no Man living be juſtified. Where we ſee a Righteouſneſs, according to which no Man can be heard, no Man can be accepted, no Man can ſtand in his ſight, *Pſal* 143. 1, 2. Thus much then is plain, that here is a *Righteouſneſs*, and a *Righteouſneſs*. A Righteouſneſs (I may ſay) of *ſtrict Juſtice*, or a Righteouſneſs of *gracious Acceptation*. A Righteouſneſs which is *Severe* Juſtice, or *Paternal* Juſtice. The Righteouſneſs of a condeſcending Father, or of a rigid Judge: *David* does, as it were, appeal from the one to the other. Any one may expreſs themſelves in other Terms, as pleaſe them beſt: But ſuch a Diſtinction then is to be made in reality, according to the Scriptures. I will therefore offer yet theſe other words: There is a Righteouſneſs, (as to us) κατ' ἀκρίβειαν, or κατ' ἐπιείκειαν: A Righteouſneſs (to be moſt plain and full) according to the *Law*, or Covenant of *Works*, whereby God *might* deal with us if he would, and ſo no Man could *Live*: Or a Righteouſneſs according to the Covenant of *Grace*, which is this *Righteouſneſs* the Apoſtle means now *revealed*, (as that by which he *does* deal with us) in the Goſpel. *God is not unrighteous* (ſays one Apoſtle) *to forget your Labour of Love*, Heb. 11. 10. *If we confeſs our Sins, he is faithful and juſt* (ſays another) *to forgive us our Sins, and to cleanſe us from our Unrighteouſneſs*, 1 Joh. 1. 9. *It is a righteous thing with God, to render to you reſt, when the Lord Jeſus ſhall be revealed*, 2 Theſ. 1. 7. *I have fought a good Fight, and kept the Faith, henceforth is laid up for me a Crown of Righteouſneſs, which the righteous Judge ſhall give me, and all that love his appearing*, 2 Tim. 4. 8. *He ſhall pray unto God, and he will be favourable to him, for he will render to Man his Righteouſneſs*, Job 33. 26. *Judge me, Lord, according to my Righteouſneſs, and according to my Integrity*, Pſal. 7. 8. *The Lord rewarded me according to my Righteouſneſs: for I have kept the ways of the Lord*, Pſal. 18. 20, 21. *Remember me, O Lord, I beſeech thee, how I have walked before thee in truth, and with a perfect Heart, and have done that which is good in thy ſight*, Iſa. 38. 3. *Remember me, O God, concerning this, and wipe not out my good Deeds I have done for the Houſe of my God, and the Offices thereof*, Neh. 13. 14. *Remember me, O God, for good*, ch. ult. v. ult. By theſe and the like places, the *Righteouſneſs of God*, (this Righteouſneſs the Apoſtle ſpeaks of) may be taken *Subjective*, or *Terminative*, in regard to *himſelf*, or in regard to *us*; Or to wave School-Terms, and ſpeak ſurer, *on His part*, or *on Our part*. On *God's* part, this Righteouſneſs is his Grace, or Condeſcention towards us, in pardoning

doning the Failings, and accepting the Endeavours of all penitent believing Men and Women (ſo long as they be ſincere, notwithſtanding thoſe Failings) unto Life, according to the New Covenant: And on *Our* part, it is theſe Endeavours thus accepted, or that which we do (our believing, or repenting) how frail ſoever (if ſincere), being the Condition required of us in that Covenant, to our Juſtification and Salvation.

Now the Righteouſneſs of God without the Law (without the performance thereof) *is manifeſt*, ſays the Apoſtle. It was always in the World, but *occult* (as *Auſtine*, I have ſaid in my firſt Sheets, does ſpeak) 'till the Preaching of the Goſpel. How is that? Why, in regard to the Foundation (I count) on which it ſtands. *For other Foundation can no Man lay, than that is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt*, 1 Cor. 3. 11. This Righteouſneſs of God, which is, I ſay, on God's part, his Grace, or Condeſcention toward us, in paſſing by our Failings, and accepting our ſincere Endeavours unto Life, notwithſtanding all our Imperfections, is procured for, and vouchſafed to us, upon the Account of Chriſt's Satisfaction and Righteouſneſs, the meritorious Cauſe of the Acceptance and Salvation of all that were ſaved under the Old Teſtament, as well as of us now; but that this Grace ſtood, and was vouchſafed then upon this Account (upon Chriſt's Account) was dark to them, and they ſaw it not as we now do, and therefore is this Righteouſneſs of God ſaid to be *revealed* now, tho' always afoot, ſo as they had the benefit then, or elſe none before now could have been ſaved.

I am not aſhamed of the Goſpel, for therein (the Apoſtle goes on) *is the Righteouſneſs of God revealed from Faith to Faith.* From Faith to Faith: And what means that? Why this is the meaning, * *From Faith*, or Truſt in God's Goodneſs, Grace, or Mercy, which any *in every Nation that feared God, and wrought Righteouſneſs* had, thus to be accepted and pardoned, before they knew this Ground or Foundation, upon which the

* There is one *Religion*, *Law*, or *Rule* for all Mankind to obtain Life by, which being the Law of our *Lapſed Nature*, or *Remedying* Law, containing God's Grace adminiſtred to all the Earth, in a Threefold State, of ſuch as were, or are *without the Law*, (or before it) and *under the Law*, and under the *Goſpel*: As this Adminiſtration is Threefold, ſo hath the *Faith*, which is the Condition thereof, been diverſified: *But now is the Righteouſneſs of God revealed from Faith to Faith.* The Righteouſneſs of God, is the Righteouſneſs of this Law, which hath ever been afoot in the World, and tho' a Heathen hath not that Faith, as is required of the Chriſtian in the *Third Edition* of it, or that which was required of the *Jew* in the *Second*; yet hath he ſuch a Faith as belongs to the *Firſt*, ſuch as the Ancients before *Abraham* had, and ſo long as that Faith he hath does *work by Love*, or by ſincere Obedience to God, according to his Light, it will juſtifie him as well as that which is now farther required of us under the Goſpel. So my Book call'd, *The Axe laid to the Root of Separation*, p. 4.

the

the Righteouſneſs thereof does ſtand, *to that Faith* we have now who do know it. *From that Faith* they had in God to ſave them of his Free Grace, before the knowledge (or our clearer knowledge) of Chriſt, and our Redemption by him, *to that Faith we* have now to ſave us, by the ſame Free Grace, *through the Redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus. Ye believe in God* (ſays Chriſt) *believe alſo in me:* where is a *Faith*, and a *Faith*. Conſequently *from Faith*, that is, a believing *in God, to a Faith* which is a believing in him, *through Chriſt*, (the Foundation of our Faith) upon the Revelation of the Goſpel.

Even the Righteouſneſs of God, which is by Faith of Jeſus Chriſt; to wit, ſince he is *revealed*. Upon theſe words Mr. *Rutherford* ſuppoſing the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to be the *formal Righteouſneſs* that juſtifies us, thus oppoſes: *If our Righteouſneſs and inherent Obedience may be of Grace eſteemed formal Righteouſneſs before God, by a free Evangelick Paction, and an Act of God's Free Will, there is no need of Chriſt's Satisfaction.* Cou. Op. *p.* 172, 173. I anſwer: This Learned Man hath, I account, here, underſtandingly expreſt the very thing as it is; and that he gives for the Reaſon of his denial, is the very Ground upon which this Righteouſneſs, as I have explained it, is made good. If it were not for this Satisfaction of Chriſt, there could be no ſuch Righteouſneſs on God's part, or on Ours. God ſhould deal with us in his *ſtrict Juſtice*, and no Man be found righteous (accounted or dealt with as ſo) in the Earth: But ſeeing upon this Satisfaction of Chriſt God may be righteous, and abate the Terms, as they were in *one* Covenant, and impute them however for Righteouſneſs by *another*, we ſee how our Evangelick Obedience is indeed the *Formal*, when Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the *Meritorious* Cauſe of our Juſtification. Our Juſtification, I muſt ſay, *paſſively taken*; that is, the Formal Cauſe, or Formal Reaſon, or Form itſelf of that *Righteouſneſs* whereby we are juſtified. That which we do our ſelves, through Grace, or the Spirit acting us, is this our *Formal Righteouſneſs*, and that is the *Condition* of our Juſtification *actively taken*, and ſo of the *Impunity* and *Life*, that follow as the Fruits of it.

That we may not ſtray here, but keep our *Middle-Way*, between the Extreams of *Papiſt* and *Proteſtant*, we muſt diſtinguiſh *Remiſſion* and *Juſtification*. The Papiſts ſay, Juſtification is Remiſſion and Regeneration; the Proteſtants ſay, it is Remiſſion, and the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. When both then

make

make Remiſſion to be but part of Juſtification, and *Totum* and *Pars* may be diſtinguiſhed, theſe may. But I go farther: That which goes before, and that which comes after Juſtification, muſt be diſtinguiſhed from it: but ſuch is Remiſſion. Remiſſion therefore is Two-fold, *Univerſal and Conditional* (the one): *Particular and Abſolute* (the other). Univerſal Conditional Remiſſion goes before Juſtification, Particular Abſolute, follows as its Effect, and ſo *Neither* muſt be made the Formal Reaſon of it. *He hath given us the Word of Reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Chriſt reconciling the World to himſelf, not imputing their Treſpaſſes.——And we are his Embaſſadors, beſeeching you in Chriſt's ſtead to be reconciled unto God*, 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19, 20. Here we ſee a *Reconciliation of God to us*, obtained for the World; ſo that a *Non-imputation of Treſpaſſes* belongs to all, which yet precedes our being *Reconciled to him*, and conſequently our actual Believing and Juſtification. The Reconciliation of the World to God by the Non-imputation of Sin in this Text, is indeed no other but what the Apoſtle otherwhere calls Redemption: *In whom we have Redemption through his Blood, even the Forgiveneſs of Sins*, Eph. 1. 7. Col. 1. 14. Now that Redemption does precede Juſtification, both in the Nature of the Thing, and Intent of the Apoſtle, is manifeſt, *Rom.* 3. 24. *Being juſtified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus.* Redemption is the Ground (we ſee) of our Juſtification, and the Ground is neceſſarily firſt to be ſuppoſed, before that which is built upon it. And what is Redemption? Redemption is Chriſt's procuring (or purchaſe) of Man's delivery from Wrath due to us, according to the Law for Sin, (or of our diſcharge from the Penalty, called ſometimes *Freedom from the Law*, ſometimes *Forgiveneſs of Sins*) by the Price of his Blood, or Satisfaction in our behalf, but to be given out to us no otherwiſe than as God and Chriſt pleaſe; and that is upon the Terms of the Goſpel. Of this Remiſſion, which preceding Juſtification muſt be *Univerſal* (for where it is *Particular*, the Man is juſtified) and *Conditional* (for if it were *Abſolute*, all muſt be ſaved) no Man muſt conceive me to imagine our Righteouſneſs the *Formal Cauſe*, or any Cauſe, nay, or Condition: Nevertheleſs, this General Remiſſion being given out (I ſay) to particular Perſons, by a new Law or Covenant, which requires of us to the participating thereof, that we believe, repent, and walk ſincerely before God, this Evangelical Righteouſneſs, upon that Account, is the Thing that Formally juſtifies us. Upon our

Faith

Faith God does account us Believers, or Performers of this Law or Covenant, that is righteous by the Righteousneſs of Faith (the *Forma per quam*, we are made ſo), and then this Remiſſion before Conditional, becomes Abſolute, (or *Actual* Remiſſion, ſo commonly called) as the Effect (together with a Right to Heaven) of this Juſtification. Now when the Proteſtants ordinarily, that diſtinguiſh not Remiſſion from Juſtification, are vehement here, (in reference to *Grace* and *Works*) and ſay, that no Man does, or can do any thing in order to the Remiſſion of his Sin: That there is nothing, and can be nothing in the whole World interpoſed between our Sins and God's Wrath, to ſtave that off us, but Chriſt's Satisfaction, which was made by him, and accepted of God for us, while we are *Sinners, Enemies*, and have no other Qualification, ſo that therefore our Righteouſneſs is ſo far from being any *Cauſe* (Efficient, Material, or Formal) that it is not ſo much as a *Condition* of it, I ſay, it is all true, it is all granted. The Abſolute Free Grace of God, and our Redeemer, is to be received with the utmoſt Humility of our Hearts, and Thankfulneſs. Only one thing is neceſſary, which is, that it be underſtood aright. It muſt be underſtood of the Remiſſion which precedes Juſtification: It muſt be underſtood of this Univerſal Conditional Remiſſion, Reconciliation, Redemption, when that Remiſſion which comes after Juſtification as its Effect; that is, Particular Abſolute, or Actual Remiſſion, is made ſo, or obtained only, upon the Terms of the Goſpel.

As in our Laws, when a Law that is good, proves inconvenient, we make a New one, that does not Repeal that Law, but brings a Remedy againſt that Inconvenience: So is it here. The Law of Innocency, or Nature, is good, and ſuch as ſtands, and muſt ſtand, in all reſpects Unrepealed for ever; but upon Man's Fall there being this Inconvenience, that no Man being able to perform it perfectly we muſt all periſh, a New Law is obtained by Chriſt, and granted by God, or an Act of Grace paſſed, by way of Remedy, (a Remedying Law) which Enacts thus: That tho' a Man does not fulfil this Law of Works, as all ought, yet if he Believes and Repents only, he ſhall be pardoned and ſaved. Every Man that does not, is condemned already; but if he does, as ſoon as he does, he is juſtified by this New Law from that Condemnation.

When I ſee Men denominated Righteous, through the Old and New Teſtament, only from their upright Walking with God,

God, and yet the moſt Upright to have their Failings, and to place their Comfort and Hopes in God's Mercy and Grace, to pardon their Failings, and accept their Endeavours to pleaſe him, notwithſtanding their Imperfections, as we may obſerve more eſpecially in the *Pſalms*: When thoſe Chriſtians that have gone before us, holy Men, and Fathers, have ſignified the like Temper in ſuch like Expreſſions [*Tota juſtitia mea Domine, eſt tui indulgentia. Væ hominum vitæ quantumvis laudabili ſi remota miſericordia judicetur. Inhærens juſtitia ſanctorum in hac Vita magis remiſſione peccatorum conſtat quam perfectione Virtutum. Ego fidenter quod ex me mihi deeſt uſurpo mihi ex viſceribus Domini, quoniam miſericordia affluunt, nec deſunt foramina per quæ effluunt. Omnia facta deputantur cum quod non fit ignoſcitur*]: And when in their Prayers after Confeſſion of Sin, they have been wont, as they uſed to expreſs themſelves, to fly from God's *Tribunal* of Juſtice, to his *Throne of Grace*, from his Severity to his Mercy through Chriſt, Which *through Chriſt* muſt be for his *Merits ſake*, not through his *imputed Righteouſneß*; for then they ſhould ſtay at the Bar of his *Juſtice* ſtill, and by the *Law* be juſtified: When, I ſay, I let theſe Reflections enter my Soul, I cannot but be perſwaded, that the *Righteouſneß of God*, whereof I am ſpeaking, and the Goſpel hath *Revealed* to be that Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified in oppoſition to *Works*, muſt receive between *Proteſtant* and *Papiſt*, a Middle Expoſition.

And what now is ſaid hitherto, may be confirmed by the Light it brings, for the underſtanding ſeveral Scriptures, which are otherwiſe very hard of Interpretation. I will begin with that in *Romans the Firſt*, where we find a *Free Gift* mentioned in ſeveral places, which, *by the Righteouſneß of One, came upon All Men* (the Apoſtle ſpeaks) *unto Juſtification*. What is that *Free Gift*? In one Verſe we are told, it is the Gift of *Righteouſneß*. But what Righteouſneſs? Is it the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt? Our Proteſtants (even the judicious *Davenant*) againſt the Papiſts, ſay ſo; but it cannot be: For that which comes by the *Righteouſneß of One*, cannot be that *Righteouſneß of One* itſelf, nor Juſtification itſelf that follows it. What is it then? Why, very probably, this *Righteouſneß of God* we are ſpeaking of, that runs ſo much in the Apoſtle's Mind; which is on God's part the Grace of the Goſpel, that gives Pardon and Life, upon Condition of Faith (and ſo brings Salvation to all Men) procured by this *Righteouſneß of One*, and that as the *Medium* to Man's Juſtifi-

cation. By this Key, let him that will, and has a better Faculty of Words than I, open for me the reſt of the Chapter.

I proceed to another Text, *Rom.* 3. 31. *Do we then make void the Law by Faith! God forbid: Yea, we eſtabliſh the Law.* How is that? The Law is eſtabliſhed, I remember *Auſtin* tells us, *Implendo*, and Faith does eſtabliſh it by fetching Grace from God to fulfil it. So he. I add, by fetching, not only this Grace which is Inherent and Operative, but that Grace which is Favour and Mercy, in pardoning all that is defective, and accepting what is done (how weak ſoever, if ſincere, notwithſtanding thoſe Failings) unto Life, through the Merits of Chriſt Jeſus. Or thus: It is done by Faith; becauſe Faith, which is ſound and works by Love, is this very *Righteouſneſs of God* (on our part) we ſpeak of, which he accepts of unto Life, inſtead of that of the Law, upon Chriſt's Account. And here are there certain Words I meet with in *Melanchon* and *Chemnitius*, which (tho' not in *their* perfect Sence) may be uſed and approved. Faith eſtabliſhes the Law (ſay they) *Dupliciter*, by *Inchoation*, and by *Imputation*. By Inchoation in the New Obedience, whereof Faith is the Principle, or Faith receives the Spirit (as they ſpeak) to work in us that Obedience: And then by Imputation, in that our inchoate Obedience being imperfect, and not anſwering the Law, Faith doth apply the Satisfaction and Merits of Chriſt (already intimated) for the pardoning all its Defects, and rendring it acceptable to God for his ſake. This I take to be agreeable to the Father before quoted, *Tunc tota lex impletur, quando id quod non fit ignoſcitur*: Only I muſt add, *Et quando id quod fit imputatur ad juſtitiam propter Chriſtum.* I know theſe worthy Followers of *Luther*, and alſo, moſt of *Calvin*'s Followers, do underſtand by their *Imputation* more than thus; even, no leſs, than that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is made ours by Faith; ſo as God does reckon the Believer to have ſatisfied, and obeyed the Law in him: Upon ſuppoſition of which Notion, here were ſo eaſie a Conſtruction to be made of theſe Texts, and others that are chiefly ſtood upon, that no wonder, if after one or two ſuch Leaders, there were ſo many embraced it. If Chriſt's Righteouſneſs (which is perfect) be in a Law-ſence the Believer's, then in a Law-ſence the Believer performs it; and ſo *the Law is eſtabliſhed* according to this place. In a Law-ſence he is *made Righteous by the Obedience of One* (and ſo becomes as Righteous as that *One*) according to another Text, *Rom.* 5. 19. He is *made the*

Righteouſneſs

Righteouſneſs of God in him (Indued with the Righteouſneſs of him, who is God) according to 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. But the words *Of* and *In*, *Of God*, and *In Him*, do plainly ſhew, that *God* and *Him* are two; and conſequently, that ſerious Man, Mr. *Mather*, (with ſuch other Divines) muſt be out, when they underſtand by the *Righteouſneſs of God*, the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, who is God*; ſeeing this Conſtruction makes them one.

* Beſides, *That we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*, is expreſſed by the Apoſtle, as the End, or Effect, of his being *made Sin for us*. He was made Sin for us, not *Formaliter*, but *Effective*, in ſuffering for our Sins. His Sufferings was his Obedience, and that, his Righteouſneſs. By the *Righteouſneſs of God* therefore, we muſt not underſtand the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, becauſe that which is the End, or Effect of a Thing, cannot be the very ſame Thing, but another differing from it. There is yet that Text more, which will receive the like eaſie Interpretation on that Suppoſition, *Chriſt is the End of the Law for Righteouſneſs, to him that believeth*, the Believer being righteous *In* and *With* (and not only *meritory By*) his Righteouſneſs, according to *Rom.* 10. 4. But the Suppoſition really is too groſs, the Notion too hard to be digeſted, as well as dangerous, in regard to the *Antinomian* Conſequences of it. If in a *Law-ſence* we are righteous, and have fulfilled the Law in Chriſt, then in a *Law-ſence* God ſees no Sin in us, we need no Pardon, God cannot in Juſtice puniſh for any thing we do, with the *Lerna* of the like Doctrines which follow upon it. If in a *Law-ſence* Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is ours, and we have fulfilled the Law in him, then are we in a *Law-ſence* juſtified by *Works*, when *by the Works of the Law* (the Scripture ſays) *no Fleſh living ſhall be juſtified*. If the Notion of Faith being imputed for Righteouſneſs (which is Scripture) muſt be ſo framed, as by Faith we muſt underſtand its Object, Chriſt's Righteouſneſs ſo imputed, but firſt received by Faith, or made ours by Faith, as the Inſtrument of that Reception, How then ſhall thoſe many Fathers, and Holy Men before *Luther*, who never had any ſuch Notion in their Minds, Nay, how ſhall the Patriarchs, and all the Holy People from *Adam* to *Chriſt*, have been juſtified (as we), which is to be Righteous with this Righteouſneſs, when they never had the *Inſtrument* to receive it? An Inſtrument is that the Efficient

* Juſtitia Dei eſt finis ſive effectum ex eo quod Chriſtus peccatum pro nobis factus eſt. Hoc autem ipſum eſt Chriſti Obedientia. Ergo Juſtitia Dei non eſt Chriſti Obedientia. *Wotton.*

works by; And when there is not the working Cauſe, how can there be the Effect? It is not credible to me, that ever any one before Chriſt, or any of his Diſciples before his Death, did, or could believe themſelves Righteous, by the Satisfaction and Obedience of the Meſſiah, in this ſence, that his Righteouſneſs ſhould, or could be their Formal Righteouſneſs, when, As St. *John* tells us, *He that doth Righteouſneß is righteous*, ſo is this Righteouſneſs *done*, the *Formal Righteouſneß*, and Chriſt's Obedience and Satisfaction, the *Meritorious Cauſe* (and the Account we give) of its acceptance, in the Sinners Juſtification.

A Third Text, and parallel Place, we have in *Rom.* 8. 3, 4. *What the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the Fleſh*, &c. That is, I ſuppoſe, when through the Fall, no Man could perform the Condition of the Law of Works, *God ſent his Son*, as it follows, to be a Sacrifice for Sin, to procure a Law of Grace, *That the Righteouſneß of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the Fleſh, but after the Spirit.* How is that? when none can fulfil the Law through the Weakneſs of the Fleſh, do we fulfil it? Yes: It is not ſaid fulfilled *in Chriſt*, but *in Us*, and it is fulfilled by this *Righteouſneß of God*; which being on our part all one with the *Obedience of Faith*, God upon Chriſt's Account, imputes that to us for Righteouſneſs, or reckons it, inſtead of fulfilling it, making it as good to us, and rewarding us alike, as if we had perfectly performed it. It is an Obedience or Righteouſneſs indeed, not κατ' ἀκρίβειαν, (as I have it before) according to the Rigour of the Law, but κατ' ἐπιείκειαν, according to the Equity of the Goſpel. It is not in its own Nature a Righouſneſs (falling ſhort of the Law) that would juſtifie us, but it does it by *Divine Inſtitution*, and therefore called the *Righteouſneß of God*. It is an Ordination of Grace, through Jeſus Chriſt, and therefore is God righteous in what he does: But on our part it is called *the Righteouſneß of Faith*. I do obſerve therefore, how that Religiouſly Learned Gentleman, Sir *Charles Wokſley*, having wrote his Book of *Juſtification* after I had wrote, and he had read my Sheets on the ſame Subject, hath theſe Words upon that forementioned Critical Place, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *The meaning is this*, ſays he, *Chriſt that was without all Sin, was ordained of God to be a Sacrifice for Sin, that we might thereby be made righteous with the Goſpel-Righteouſneſs, for that is the general meaning every where of the Righteouſneß of God*, Sir *C. W.* p. 64. This, I know, I delivered as my Judgment in thoſe Sheets; and his ſaying the ſame after, is

as

as much as if he had ſaid, I have conſidered what you ſay, and am convinced, that this is the meaning of that Text, and that you are right in your Sence, of the *Righteouſneſs of God.* It is a walking after the Spirit, not after the Fleſh, though not perfectly up to our Duty: *And the Law of the Spirit of Life in Chriſt Jeſus,* (after which we walk in our meaſure) *does ſet us free from the Law of Sin and Death.*

I will proceed to ſome Conſequences, like to be good or ill, as they follow, upon a right or miſtaken underſtanding of this *Righteouſneſs.* If by it, the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed* be underſtood, By the exerciſe of Faith, in apprehending the ſame to be made ours, ſo as to bring it before the Tribunal of God's Juſtice for our Juſtification thereby, according to the Law of Works, the very Life of that Faith, or Comfort of that Life, which conſiſts in truſting, reſting, relying, on God's Mercy and Goodneſs, for pardoning all the Failings of our Performances, and accepting them (even our very Deſires, and weakeſt Endeavours) through the Merits of Chriſt, unto Life, ſo as by that Faith we have acceſs to the Throne of Grace, and are juſtified according to the Goſpel, is ſtopt, perverted, if not quite contradicted, and loſt. Nay, if the End of Chriſt's Obeying and Satisfying the Law was that his Satisfaction and Obedience ſhould be made ours upon Condition, (for our Divines here, are cautious, and do generally take heed to put in that) to wit, upon Performance of the Terms the Goſpel requires of us, in order to it, and not otherwiſe, then cannot the Merits of Chriſt be (ſo rationally, I think) applied thus as I ſpeak, to the Performance of the Condition. Our Divines indeed do ſay, that Chriſt hath not only procured this Imputation on Condition, but Grace alſo for the Performance of the Condition (ſome ſay, *General* Grace for all that will, ſome *Special* that makes ſome to will), but this Condition muſt be performed (by our *Free-Will*, or *Grace*) ſo as the full Tale be brought in, or no Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed, no Merits of Chriſt otherwiſe to be applied: Whereas, if the End of Chriſt's doing and ſuffering what he did in our behalf, was that what we do our ſelves (by his Spirits preventing and aſſiſting Grace) ſhall be imputed to us for Righteouſneſs, which is the very Truth, ſeeing the Scripture ſays it, that it is *our Faith* (to wit, a ſound Faith working by Love) is, and ſhall be *ſo imputed* (that is, our Faith, Repentance, New Obedience, is accepted, in regard to the Reward, inſtead of that Righteouſneſs the

Law

Law required to our Juſtification), then we ſee what Line we have given us, for the actuating our Faith, and reliance on God's Grace, Goodneſs, Mercy, and Chriſt's Merits for Pardoning our Failings (as I am ſaying), and taking what is done in ſuch good part, as to reward it with Life, ſeeing it is for Chriſt's ſake altogether, for his Merits ſake only (not for its value), that it finds acceptation; which is the greateſt Encouragement to our Endeavours, and conſequently to a Holy Life, that can be in the World. I will add, that God our Judge, who is gracious and wiſe, does conſider the diverſe Natures, Tempers, Natural Infirmities, Temptations of Men and Women, and hath his Grains of Allowance for all, according to theſe Circumſtances, ſo as that ſhall be accepted for the Condition performed in one, that falls exceeding ſhort of what is done by another. Alas! there are ſuch diverſe Sizes of God's Children, ſo vaſt a diſproportion (I mean) as to the Degrees of their Grace, that one would hardly think them the Children of the ſame Father. What a Difference is there between a *Seth* and a *Sampſon*, *Rahab* and *Elizabeth*; Who would think that one Heaven ſhould hold them both? *He knoweth our Frame, and remembreth we are but Duſt*: Upon which Account we read ſo often, of his Compaſſions toward the Weak and Fainting, which gives us this Ground for our truſt in him, to bear with our Frailty, in mollifying to ſome the Condition (Not but all muſt be *Sincere*, but that this Sincerity is of diverſe Degrees, in the Sence I ſpeak), in regard to God's Acceptance, and *Grace*, which hath no Bounds to be ſet by any.

And now, if any pious Brother, ſhall go to take away this Doctrine from us, and the Fruit of it, I will wiſh him to take heed to his own, and conſider whither it leads. If Chriſt hath died for the Sinner, ſo that God looks on the Sinner to have ſatisfied the Law in Chriſt, then ſhould he preach this Goſpel. He ſhould declare to all, and every of his Hearers, that God is in Chriſt reconciled to him, and that he is to believe it's Chriſt hath died for Sinners, thou art a Sinner; All are Sinners, Chriſt hath died for all, and thou art to believe thy Sins forgiven. Thou art not to believe only, that there is Forgiveneſs of Sins, and Everlaſting Life, but that theſe Articles through Chriſt are thy Poſſeſſion. *Who loved Me, and gave himſelf for Me.* In Chriſt's Obedience and Sufferings thou haſt obeyed the Law, and ſatisfied the Penalty, and therefore art juſtified, and in a State of Sal-

Salvation. As for Good Works, they are indeed to be done out of Gratitude afterward. God commands them, and they pleaſe him, and they do good to Men, and therefore thou muſt do them, but nothing is to be done for thy ſelf, but believe only, in order to thy Juſtification and Salvation. Let a Man but believe once in good earneſt that it is ſo, he cannot chooſe but love God and Jeſus Chriſt, and that Love will conſtrain him to Obedience. If you hold the Doctrine of Election, he muſt not ſtick at that, but he muſt believe alſo he is Elect; and indeed, that none but the Elect can believe; that is, thus believe: Or that there can be this *Fiducia ſpecialis miſericordiæ* in none ever but the Elect only, and therefore is it called, *The Faith of God's Elect*. And what ſays any of my ſober Brethren, to this Doctrine? Can he find in his Heart to preach it, when *Chriſt*, when *John*, when *Peter* (*Acts* 2. 38.), when they began to preach, did preach, *Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*? I confeſs, that *Luther* (as I apprehend) did at firſt preach at this rate; which was the way to fetch in ſo many by the Shoals, as he did from Popery, when the World was groaning under the Burden of their Prieſts Impoſitions, their Penances, Satisfactions, Faſtings, Scourgings, praying to Saints, worſhipping Images, Pilgrimages, Indulgences, beſides the Vows of Chaſtity, Poverty, and Monaſtical Obedience, as to the more Religious, whereby they were made to believe they merited Salvation for themſelves, and others. It was glad Tydings now, and a welcome Goſpel to the World at this time, to tell them, that it is Faith alone, in oppoſition to theſe Works, that juſtifies and ſaves Men. Nevertheleſs, when that excellent Man ſaw the Effect of his own Doctrine, that ſuch as he had turned from Popery, began to run as faſt to *Antinomianiſm*, and *Libertiniſm*, he ſaw occaſion to change his Preaching, to preſs the Law, and Repentance, as much as others. Nor was the Doctrine of *Preparatory Works* (Man's lying at the Pool) Refuſed, but Sated, and Approved by his Followers. A *Convinced Sinner is the only* Subjectum capax Juſtificationis, even with Dr. *Owen*. *Of Juſt.* p. 133.

The Second PART.

I Know that ſeveral of our chiefeſt Divines, have been ſo far from imbibing the Sence of this *Righteouſneſs*, which is my Theme, *The Righteouſneſs of God revealed in the Goſpel*, that their Doctrine, in oppoſition to the Papiſts, is extream, in the thwarting (without being truly aware,) of it: When thoſe Prudential Catholicks, who underſtand, that *Qualitas Gratiæ infuſa non Naturæ ſuæ, ſed ex Dei acceptatione & ordinatione habet ut Hominem Deo gratum reddat*, are to be heard rather than them. Nay, the deep and acute Mr. *Baxter* (ſo far as I remember any thing he has) never came to lay this *Righteouſneſs of God* enough to his Thoughts, when nothing almoſt elſe eſcapes him, as it appears by his frequent approbation (or mention) of the Learned, Sober, Logically Judicious Mr. *Anthony Wotton*, and ſometimes Mr. *Hotchkis* his Follower. I will examine therefore a little into Mr. *Wotton*'s Opinion. Juſtification by him is thus defined: It is, *Reconciliationis pars, qua Deus in Chriſtum credentibus fidem reputans ad juſtitiam, omnia illis peccata condonat. Reconciliation* is God's Return into Grace and Favour with Sinners (as he ſays) whom Sin had made his Enemies, through Satisfaction given him by Chriſt. God is ſaid to be angry with Sin and Sinners, and upon Chriſt's Satisfaction, and their Repentance, to be appeaſed, or reconciled; Not that Man's Repentance, or Chriſt's Satisfaction works any change in God, but *Ex Connotatione Objecti*, God is denominated. Man's Repentance changes himſelf, and Chriſt's Satisfaction makes a change in the Order of Things; but God is unchangeable, while yet the Scripture ſpeaks, *Lingua Filiorum hominum*, as the Jews ſay, Or as the Schools, *Secundum noſtrum concipiendi modum*, in many Matters incomprehenſible. To leave Mr. *Wotton*'s *Genus Definitionis* therefore to himſelf, without farther concern, he hath defined Juſtification by *Remiſſion of Sin*, in oppoſition to thoſe that define it by the *Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*; and he hath elaborately proved this to be the Sence of the *Church of England*, and *Calvin*'s, with many others. I do now agree with Mr. *Wotton* herein, in excluding the Imputation of

of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs (in his Sence intended, that is as our *Formal Righteouſneſs)* out of the Definition, becauſe there is no ſuch thing as the Imputation thereof, *In ſe*, tho' the *Merit* of it be imputed to Believers, as to the *Effects*. But I do not agree with him, in making Remiſſion of Sin to be (that he wont let the other be) the Form, or Formal Reaſon of our Juſtification: Becauſe I hold, with Mr. *Bradſhaw*, our Actual Pardon to be the *Effect*, or *Benefit* of it. The *Righteouſneſs of God*, which is not yet throughly underſtood by Proteſtant or Papiſt, and I have made the Subject of this Diſſertation, is indeed that *Formal Righteouſneſs* we are ſeeking; and I do not think, that any Man in his firſt natural reading *Paul*'s Epiſtle to the *Romans*, who brought not his Underſtanding from without to the place, did ever apprehend by that *Righteouſneſs of God now Revealed* (when Remiſſion of Sin was a thing never *Hid)* that Pardon only is to be underſtood. I will adviſe every Judicious Man therefore, when any material Point is concerned in a Text, to ponder it in the Original ſeveral times, 'till he come to ſome Reſolution about it in his own Mind, becauſe when he hath ſucked in the Sence of another, his own Judgment is worth nothing. Mr. *Wotton* hath ſaid enough to turn a Man to his Opinion, he is ſo rational a Man; but having been myſelf otherwiſe inclined, as to the Sence of this *Righteouſneſs*, and finding the Scripture calling no Man righteous, but upon the Account of doing righteouſly, I cannot comply with Mr. *Wotton* in his Notion, nor with the contrary in ſuch, as the hitherto prevailing Dr. *Owen*, in theirs. The Miniſtry of the Goſpel, is called the *Miniſtration of Righteouſneſs*, upon the Account of *this Righteouſneſs*, as alſo the Miniſtration of the *Spirit*, in regard of the Grace the *Spirit* brings to perform it; which *Auſtine* (I remember) in his Book, *De Spiritu & Littera*, hath told us: It can by no means be called the Miniſtration *Thereof*, in regard to Remiſſion of Sins. There are many the like Arguments, I think, I could find out againſt Mr. *Wotton*'s Opinion, but that my Diſcourſe is rather to be *Demonſtrative*, than *Elenctical*; and therefore I muſt not omit that place in *Daniel*, where it is propheſied, that Chriſt ſhall *bring in Righteouſneſs*; that is, a Righteouſneſs procured by his Death and Merits, and called an *Everlaſting Righteouſneſs*, being that by which they that ever were, are, or ſhall be ſo, are juſtified, and ſaved; and it is ſaid, *brought* in, and at ſuch a time, *when the Meſſiah ſhall be ſlain*, as it is ſaid *Now Manifeſted*, or *Revealed* by the Goſpel, which

is (I ſaid but now) the *Miniſtration* of it. To which purpoſe it is to be underſtood and obſerved farther, that *Righteouſneſs* as well as *Reconciliation*, and the *making an End of* Sins, is one End of our Redemption; which I have explained more * other-where. *Daniel* 9. 24. *Titus* 2. 14.

* That the End of Chriſt's coming in the World, of our Redemption, and the Covenant of Grace, was, that we ſhould be holy and righteous, is ſaid ordinarily by Divines, according to the Scriptures; but the right and plain Underſtanding, or Reaſon, of what they ſay, is not ſaid by them. *He hath choſen us in Chriſt, that we ſhould be Holy. He hath redeemed us from Iniquity, that we ſhould be a peculiar People. We are his Workmanſhip, created unto Good Works, in* (or through) *Chriſt Jeſus.* Well! when God made Man at firſt, and gave him a Law, was it not that he ſhould live holy? And when *Righteouſneſs*, then was the End of his *Creation*, and the *Law* thereof; how is this ſaid to be the End of his *Redemption?* I anſwer therefore, Righteouſneſs (or Holineſs, as they are one) we muſt know, does lie in a Conformity to the Law which God gives us. There is nothing leſs than this (the full Performance of a Law given) that is Righteouſneſs. Upon this Account, as ſoon as Man once fell, and broke the *Law* of his *Creation*, it is impoſſible he ſhould be righteous any more, unleſs there were a *New Law* brought in, in the Performance whereof he might attain to that again which he had loſt. Now to this End was it, that Chriſt came and died; This was the very main Buſineſs (I count) of his Redemption, (as to free us from Condemnation by the Old, ſo) even the procuring this New Law, or another Law, with lower Terms, which ſome Men performing, they do thereby become righteous, and ſo have Righteouſneſs, according to that Law, imputed to them, for Remiſſion, and Life Eternal. Here you ſee what that Righteouſneſs indeed is, which Chriſt is ſaid to *bring in*, and in what Sence he hath brought it in, or how ſuch Texts (as theſe before) does attribute our Holineſs to him. It is called an *Everlaſting Righteouſneſs*, as the Goſpel is called the *Everlaſting Goſpel*, becauſe it is *the Righteouſneſs*, in oppoſition to *that* of the *Law*, or of *Works*, that all Men from the Beginning of the World, to the End of it, do obtain Everlaſting Salvation. *Mid. Way of Juſtif.* p. 43.

We'll! you will ſay then, if the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs be not the Form of our Juſtification, nor Remiſſion of Sins, when ſome Proteſtants ſay the one, and ſome the other, and ſome both, what then is the Form of it? I anſwer, Mr. *Wotton* hath told us truly, in the reſt of his Words: It is God's imputing to a Man his Faith for Righteouſneſs. This is Scripture expreſs, and the *Righteouſneſs of God* I am treating of, is otherwhere called the *Righteouſneſs of God by Faith*, and the *Righteouſneſs of Faith*; for that is expreſs Scripture alſo. Juſtification ſuppoſes a Man juſt. *Juſtificationis formam juſtitia conſtare certum eſt.* God cannot account a Man righteous, without a Righteouſneſs. The Papiſts therefore, are hot here with *Calvin*, that will have a Man be juſtified only by Remiſſion of Sins, without an inherent Righteouſneſs; and the Proteſtants as hot with the Papiſts, that will have any inherent Grace, or Righteouſneſs of ours, to be ſuch as anſwers the Law, that it ſhould juſtifie us;

for

for by Righteouſneſs both underſtand a Conformity to the Law of Works. Both therefore are out. There is no ſuch *inherent* Grace, as anſwers the Law, nor any Grace from *without* either Remiſſion of Sins or Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed, that is, or can be our *Formal Righteouſneß*; but it is Faith which is Grace and Righteouſneſs *inherent*, that juſtifies us in oppoſition to both. There is a *Righteouſneß of God*, I ſay, that is neither of theſe, unknown to the Diſputants on both ſides, that is the *Formal Righteouſneß* for which they ſtrive. St. *Auſtin* (I remember) does often tell us, that by this *Righteouſneß of God*, we muſt not underſtand that whereby himſelf is righteous, but that whereby we are ſo: As the Love of God is taken ſometimes, not for that whereby he loves us, but that whereby we love him. *Juſtitia Dei, non qua juſtus eſt, ſed qua juſtos nos facit.* I cannot forget theſe words, becauſe I find them uſed by the Council of *Trent* in their defining Juſtification. *Auſtin* believed a Righteouſneſs infuſed, a Righteouſneſs that makes a Man, *Ex impio juſtum*, and to be that which juſtifies him. He believed not this Righteouſneſs to be Remiſſion of Sins, becauſe he ſtill ſpeaks of it as *Grace inherent*, and ſometimes calls it *Charity*: But he ſeemed not to ſpeak of it as any ſuch perfect Righteouſneſs that a Man may bring to the Bar to juſtifie him, ſeeing you will ever and anon have ſuch ſenſible Expreſſions, that the beſt of Righteouſneſs that Man has, does conſiſt rather in God's being merciful to his Unrighteouſneſs, than in the Perfection of his Vertues. The truth is, I found not in Reading *Auſtine*, that he did fully underſtand himſelf, or made me to underſtand, what this *Righteouſneß of God* does mean, when the Apoſtle ſpeaks of ſomething *Myſterious* in it (he counts) but now *Revealed*. That there ſhould be a Righteouſneſs, and not anſwer the Law, a Righteouſneſs without a Conformity thereunto, this is ſomething myſterious, when there is no ſuch indeed *in Nature*: Or that *Faith without Works* ſhould yet be made or conſtituted ſuch a *Righteouſneß* as *Formally* to juſtifie us, this is the Matter *Revealed*, and called the *Righteouſneſs of God*, becauſe of this *Ordination*.

That we may not miſtake the word *Formally*, A Man may be *Formaliter* juſt two ways (ſays Mr. *Wotton*) *Qualitate & Lege*. *Qualitate*, no Man is formally juſt (he counts) but he that is perfectly conformable to the Law, which no Man is: But *Lege*, a Man is juſt (he ſays) *Formaliter*, by Pardon, *Cùm omnis imputatio culpæ ſublata eſt*. Let me give this a Turn. *Qualitate* Faith is not

Righteouſneſs (to wit, *Tali qualitate*, and *ſuch* a Righteouſneſs), but *Lege*, *Lege Evangelii*, Faith is. It is not *Ex rei Natura*, but *Ex Dei Conſtitutione*, that Faith is made the Righteouſneſs that juſtifies. The Foundation-miſtake of *Proteſtant* and *Papiſt* lies in this, that they diſpute as if it were by the *Law* we are to meaſure this *Righteouſneſs*, and be judged: When it is to be meaſured, and God will judge us according to the *Goſpel*. A Conformity to the *Law of Works*, *Fac hoc & Vives*, is the Righteouſneſs theſe Diſputants ſtill thought on, but it is a Conformity to the *New Law*, the Law of Grace, *Crede & ſaluaberis*, that St. *Paul* means by the *Righteouſneſs of God* that juſtifies Sinners. Our Divines here, ſince Mr. *Baxter* wrote, underſtand the Point better. *Juſtification* (ſays Mr. *Williams*) *is a Judicial Act of God, by a Goſpel-Rule, ſuppoſing Chriſt's Satisfaction*, Goſ. Truth, *p.* 108. There is more of Light in one ſuch Line now, than heretofore in a Volume of Diſputation. *Fides eſt conditio* (ſays Mr. *Wotton*) *& quidem talis conditio ad Juſtificationem per Chriſtum in fœdere gratuito, qualis erant Opera ad juſtificationem ex operibus Legis.* Hence I argue. But Works were the Formal Righteouſneſs of Juſtification by the Law. *Ergo*, Faith is the Formal Righteouſneſs of our Juſtification by the Goſpel.

To come more home (than I have already from the ſame Notion before in *Melanchon*, and *Chemnitius*) to the Conſcience (eſpecially the Tender one) of every Chriſtian, here are two things that go into this Formal Righteouſneſs, *Faith*, and the *Imputation* of it for Righteouſneſs. Here is Faith which is our Goſpel-Righteouſneſs, and this being ſhort, it is through Chriſt's Merits that it is imputed to us in the ſtead of one that is perfect. *Faith indeed* (ſays *Luther*, upon *Gal.* 3, *v* 6.) *is a Formal Righteouſneſs, and yet this Righteouſneſs is not enough, for after Faith there remains certain Remnants of Sin in our Fleſh, wherefore the other part of Righteouſneſs muſt be added to finiſh the ſame in us, that is to ſay, God's Imputation.* Here *Luther* acknowledges Faith is a *Formal Righteouſneſs*, which I note to remove Prejudice, but in regard to its Imperfection, there muſt be God's Imputation, or it would never juſtifie us. I ſay thus likewiſe, our Faith and Duty being imperfect, it is through Chriſt's Merits, and his Merits only, that God does accept it, or impute it for Righteouſneſs. *Chriſtian Righteouſneſs* (ſays *Luther* again) *conſiſteth in two things, Faith in the Heart, and God's Imputation.* It is lively true as to my meaning. *The holieſt Men have Concupiſcence, Paſſions, remains of Infidelity, but ſuch*

ſuch Faults (ſays he) *are not laid to their Charge, becauſe of their Faith in Chriſt.* That is, becauſe of Chriſt's Merits, our Faith relying or truſting on thoſe Merits, God forgives the Failings, and accepts of it forgiven. *Deus imputat iſtam imperfectam fidem ad juſtitiam perfectam propter Chriſtum.* This is full indeed to my purpoſe, as nothing can be fuller. But the *Lutheran* Imputation and *Mine*, I confeſs, are not the ſame. *Theirs* is an Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *in itſelf*, which cannot be ours but in Imagination; *Mine* is of the *Merit* only of his Righteouſneſs, which is made ours indeed in the *Effects*. *Theirs* is an Imputation of that Righteouſneſs *In ſe*, to the Perſon, which cannot be: *Mine*, is an Imputation of this Merit to our Performances, which does verily render them acceptable, for all their Imperfection, to Life Eternal. * I will fetch here one Leaf out of my late Book, *Pacification*, and put it into the Margin, for the Uſe and Comfort of this Explication.

* There is the *Duty*, and the *Condition* (I am ſaying there) of the Law of *Grace*, or the *Goſpel*. No Man we muſt know, does perform the *Duty*, but every Man muſt perform the *Condition* (our Divines will ſay), or he cannot be ſaved. This Condition (as obtained for the World) is the Grand Benefit of Chriſt's Purchaſe, or Main Fruit of his Death, and is accepted when performed only through him. It is not for my Works, or Merit, ſayeſt thou, that my *Perſon* is accepted, but for Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and in this alone is *thy* Comfort. And I ſay, it is not for the Works ſake, or Merit of any thing, or all we do, but for Chriſt's ſake, that the *Condition* is accepted, and in this is *my* Comfort. In this it is (I account) that we have, or can have, any grounded Suſtentation. To ſay thou art juſtified by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, when yet thou muſt acknowledge his Righteouſneſs is none of thine, unleſs thou haſt performed the Condition, what empty Comfort is that? But to ſay that through Chriſt's Merits and Righteouſneſs, this itſelf, which I do, is the Condition, here is Comfort indeed. That, what we are enabled by his Grace (I ſay) to do, how little ſoever, if ſincerely done (if it be but *the Grain of Muſtard-ſeed, in a hungring and thirſting after Righteouſneſs*) ſhall be accepted unto Life (that is, be *that Condition*) upon the Account of what Chriſt hath done for us, this, I ſay, is ſolid Conſolation. Thou ſayeſt, when I look on my Works my Heart ſinks, I am not ſure I am ſincere, but in the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt I am ſafe. I ſay, this is certain, if thou art not ſincere, thou art not ſafe: And when I doubt whether I am or not, I can have no Support but in this, that I hope I am, I truſt I am; and that it is upon the Satisfaction and Merit of Chriſt, that Faith, that Hope does depend. For that there is any Condition at all, that the Condition is ſuch, that what I do ſhall be accepted as the Condition performed, it muſt be all put upon Chriſt's Performance and Merit in our behalf; and his *Merit* is ſufficient however imperfect be our *Duty*, for its acceptance with God. When then upon a Sence of my Deficiency, inſtead of ſinking I grow bolder in my reliance on Chriſt's Merits, and God's Mercy, I do not preſume on myſelf, but I magnifie his Grace, and the higher I raiſe my Faith thereupon (provided I live not willingly in any Conſcience-waſting Sin) the more Glory (am I humbly perſwaded) do I give my gracious Saviour, and good God. Thou Man, haſt the Comfort to apply *to thy ſelf* Chriſt's Merits, if thou haſt performed the Condition: But I have the Comfort to apply Chriſt's Merits *to the Condition*, which makes his *Yoke eaſie, and his Burden light*, as to the Performance, and my Defires and weakeſt Endeavours to find Acceptance.

When I read such Prayers of *David*, That God would not *enter into Judgment* with him, that he would not be *extream to mark* what he had done *amiss*, for then he *could not abide it*, and that yet he will have God to *search* him, *and try his Reins and Heart*, and the like, I cannot but be convinced, that in the Acceptance of such an imperfect Righteousness, as he accounted his was, through God's meer gracious Condescension, Mercy, and Forgiveness to him he placed his Justification; in which Sence also he calls him *the God of his Righteousness*: When as for any Acceptance of him through the Righteousness of the Messiah to come, a Righteousness without him made his by Faith, which could abide God's district Justice, I find not the Footstep of one such Thought. To rely therefore (I will say) on Christ's Righteousness as ours, without regard to any thing *within*, or without regard to the *Condition*, is *Self-deceiving*: But to rely on God's Mercy, and on Christ's Merits for Acceptance of what we do, and Pardon for the Failings, is substantial Religion; and of *Justification by Faith in Christ's Blood*, a good Exposition.

I return to Mr. *Wotton*, who indeed does sweat with stir to prove that Remission of Sin is *Righteousness*, for wiping off that blame the Papists lay on his Opinion, that a Man is justified without a Righteousness, if it be by Pardon only. But this I stick upon, that though Pardon in some Sence is, or may be called Righteousness, yet is it not *this Righteousness*, it is not the *Righteousness of God* I am concerned about that the Apostle means, and which is (by Mr. *Wotton*'s own acknowledgment) that which justifies the Believer. It did (I must needs say) at first, and still does *move* me, that I find not one Scripture from *Genesis* to the *Revelation*, that denominates any one to be a just or righteous Person from Pardon, but from his righteous living [*He that doeth Righteousness is righteous*]: Yet that which does *convince* me is, that by Mr. *Wotton*'s leave, it is not *Remission of Sin*, in opposition to Works, but this *Righteousness of God* in opposition to *Works* (and that is our *Evangelical Righteousness*) which the Apostle means, while he contends that it is by *Faith*, and not *Works*, that we are *justified*, or that is Faith and not Works is our *Formal Righteousness* in Justification. See a peculiar Argument I offer in my *Mid. Way of Just.* p. 48. I am (I say) *convinced* that the Notion the Apostle had of Justification could not be Pardon, because in his Dispute whether it be by *Faith* or *Works* we are justified, he does suppose, that if a Man *had Works*, they would *justifie* him, and make the *Reward of Debt*, but that *Abraham*, and none had, or have them: And consequently while he supposes that if a Man could keep the Law (as if *Adam* in Innocency had kept it) he should be *justified*, it is plain he cannot understand *Pardon* by *Justification*, seeing where such Works are, that is perfect Works (which he certainly means) there were no Sin, to Pardon. This Argument may be more pungently framed than

than it is here or there, but the Medium of Probation aroſe to me in my Mind as perfect Conviction. I will now define Juſtification.

Juſtification is an Act of Free Grace, whereby God imputes to every Sound Believer his Faith for Righteouſneſs, upon the Account of Chriſt's Satisfaction and Merits, giving him Pardon and Life as the Benefits of it. I need ſay nothing of the *Genus Definiti*, [*an Act of Free Grace*] it is the Aſſemblies. By a *Sound Believer* I mean one, whoſe Faith works by Love, including Repentance and New Obedience, which together makes our Evangelical Righteouſneſs: And this Sound Faith is *imputed for Righteouſneſs*, I account, in this Sence, that God does accept it in the room of a perfect Righteouſneſs, not accounting it as perfect, but accepting it (I ſay) in the room of that Perfection required unto Life by the Law, and conſequently rewarding it for Chriſt's Merit ſake, as much, if not more, than if it were *that*. I add then, *giving Pardon and Life*, as the *Effects* or *Benefits*, diſtinguiſhed from the *Form* of Juſtification. A Right to Impunity and Life Chriſt hath purchaſed, and gives by his Covenant; they that are juſtified by this Covenant, are adjudged to theſe Benefits, ſo that Pardon and Salvation flow to us (I ſay) as the *Benefits*, and are not the *Form* of Juſtification. One of them is never accounted to be the *Form*, and by the ſame Reaſon neither may be the other. The Goſpel-Law, or Covenant, does both make and declare all Believers righteous (as having a Right to the Benefits of it, by Performance of the Condition): But as for this or that particular Perſon that is a Believer, or Performer, it is God muſt be Judge. This *Judgment* is to be ſuppoſed preceding, and the Benefits to be actually conferred by it. When I ſay this Righteouſneſs (or Faith) is the Form, I underſtand it in that Sence as theſe Divines do, who ſay, Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the Form, or Remiſſion is the Form (the Word therefore is not to be ſcrupled), not the Form of that Imputation, but of Juſtification paſſively taken. I add at laſt, *upon the Account of Chriſt's Merits*, or through Chriſt, or for Chriſt's ſake, becauſe this Faith of ours, or Evangelick Righteouſneſs, hath ſo many Defects in the beſt of Chriſtians, that if through the Sacrifice of Chriſt they were not pardoned, and through his Merits that imperfect Duty which is done accepted, it could not be imputed to us for Righteouſneſs. And I do more eſpecially ſignifie thereby, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, which cannot be imputed to us as the *Formal*

Cauſe

Cauſe of our Juſtification, is, and muſt be very carefully brought to our Account (and granted to be imputed) as the *Meritorious Cauſe* of that Acceptation. And in making it the *Meritorious*, I have learn'd of Mr. *Baxter*, to allow it to be the *Material* alſo (which he ſays is nothing elſe but to be the *Matter* of that *Merit*) becauſe I make our Faith the *Formal*, in our Juſtification. After this I diſtinguiſh between this pardoning, and bearing with the Defects of our Faith, Repentance, New Obedience, which are the Conditions of the Goſpel Covenant, and ſo our Goſpel-Righteouſneſs, or that which is imputed for Righteouſneſs; and that General or Total Pardon which the Covenant promiſes, and becomes Abſolute upon performing the Condition. The one of theſe is that very Grace, or Act of Grace itſelf, as goes into that Act of Imputation, or Act, that imputes our Faith for Righteouſneſs, when the other I ſay ſtill, is the Effect or Benefit following Juſtification.

Juſtification being thus defined by God's imputing a Man's Faith to him for Righteouſneſs, it may be underſtood what Mr. *Baxter* ſtill tells us, that Juſtification is the *making* us righteous, as well as the *accounting* us righteous, and *dealing* with us as righteous. I have been ſhy hitherto of admitting the firſt of theſe, becauſe of the Papiſts, but I will now diſtinguiſh. There is a making a Man juſt or righteous by *Infuſion*, or by *Imputation*. Gods making a Man juſt by Infuſion is *Regeneration*, which the Papiſts hold, and we diſtinguiſh from *Juſtification*. I ſuppoſe Mr. *Baxter* once intended no other. Thoſe that will have Juſtification nothing but Forgiveneſs do readily grant this, that Juſtification makes one juſt, for when Sin is forgiven, ſo that there is not the Guilt of any Omiſſion or Commiſſion imputed to a Perſon, he is made Righteous by Non-imputation. But I am for neither of theſe. Juſtification is not making a Man righteous by *Infuſion*, nor by *Non imputation*, but by *Imputation*, God imputing our Faith to us for Righteouſneſs. *Per formalem Juſtificationis cauſam juſti conſtituimur.* Our *Faith* and Evangelick Obedience is imperfect and ſinful, and we are unrighteous in the Eye of the Law for all that, but God in his judging us according to the Law of Grace, does allow of *that* for Chriſt's ſake, inſtead of all which the Law requires to our Juſtification. By this may that Expreſſion of the Apoſtle, that *God juſtifies the Ungodly*, be rightly underſtood. Not in the Sence of either of the former, that take it only in *Senſu diviſo*, ſo that he who before his Juſtification was

ungodly,

ungodly, is no longer ſo after, but *In ſenſu compoſito*. Our Faith, I ſay, or Evangelical Obedience, in regard to the *Law*, or in regard to thoſe Works that are required by the Law to our Juſtification, are no Righteouſneſs, no Righteouſneſs which in its own Nature would juſtifie us, but God conſtitutes it ſuch by the Law of the Goſpel, and according to that Law imputes it to us for Righteouſneſs. A Man believes; Let us ſuppoſe that Sound Faith; The Spirit muſt have been given to work it in him; Where the Spirit is given to work inherent Grace in a Perſon, he is Regenerate; But this *Regeneration* is not *Juſtification*. For ſuppoſe a Regenerate Man ſhould live all his Life as righteouſly as he is able, yet if God ſhould deal with him according to the Law of Works, he is ſtill *ungodly* in that regard, and he could not be juſtified, and God's dealing with him otherwiſe according to his Law of Grace, and accounting or adjudging him righteous by that Law, notwithſtanding all his Failings for Chriſt's ſake, is this *imputing Faith to him for Righteouſneſs*, which is the Formal Reaſon of Juſtification.

I muſt take leave to rake this again a little over, for I ſee ſome need, and I muſt confeſs Mr. *Baxter* hath perplexed me often as to this particular. In ſome of his Books he ſpeaks of Juſtification, *making us juſt* by Pardon, which freeing us from the Guilt of all Sin, Omiſſion, and Commiſſion, does make us (he accounts) righteous as we can be made. In others he ſeems to underſtand with *Auguſtine*, that Juſtification makes us juſt by Grace inherent. A Man muſt believe and repent before he is juſtified; He cannot do that without God's Grace; God does therefore firſt make him righteous by this inherent Grace, before he accounts him juſt, or deals with him as ſuch. Mr. *Baxter* was induced to this (I think) by the Judicious *Le Blanc*, who apprehends that there are three or four places (for which he quotes ſome of our chief Proteſtants) that make Juſtification the ſame with Sanctification. Unto which Texts I ſhould chooſe rather to give Anſwer according to others, than to conſent to this, becauſe it comes ſo near the Papiſts, as to leave us almoſt no difference from them. I will therefore advance here a Diſtinction to the ſame purpoſe as but now, which among the many Mr. *Baxter* hath, he yet has not, and it is this. There is a threefold making a Man juſt. By *Converſion*, or Regeneration, and this is *Auſtine's*, and the *Papiſts* Juſtification. By *Pardon*, and this is Mr. *Wotton's* Juſtification. Or by the *Righteouſneſs of God*, which I

made the Subject of these Sheets, as something between *Protestant* and *Papist*, and this is God's imputing our Faith for Righteousness, which is *my* Justification, and I will call it *mine*, because I take it to be the *Scriptures*, where it is expresly delivered, as cannot be gainsaid. The *Papists* Opinion (to make things clear) is that the Grace of God infused is the Formal Righteousness that justifies us, or makes us just in God's sight, according to the Law of Works. *Justitia Habitualis à Deo infusa satis est ut homo illa indutus possit in Divino judicio sisti & vere justus haberi.* In this Sence the Protestants lay down this contrary Position, that a Sinner is justified, *not by any Formal Righteousness in himself, but by the Mercy of God, through the Satisfaction of Christ.* The Protestants I own here against the Papist, according to the *Papists Sence.* Our Faith, or Evangelick Righteousness, or inherent Grace (I must say this over) is imperfect, and cannot be our *Formal Righteousness* according to the *Law*, it is no Conformity to the Law of *Works*, and they of *Trent* thought of no other: but our imperfect Faith, Repentance, New Obedience, is a Conformity to that which God hath made the Condition of Life by his Law of *Grace*, or the Gospel, and is our Formal Righteousness according to that Law, being made so by that Act of *Imputation*, which may be attributed to *God*, or his Law, when he imputes it to us for Righteousness, as I have had it already. *By the Evangelical Law this is our Righteousness, we are made righteous, that is, not guilty of the Non-performance of the Condition*, according to Mr. *Baxter.* To this purpose aforesaid I will note, that when in that remarkable Text (*Rom.* 3. 30.) *Predestination, Calling, Justification*, and *Glorification*, are linked without mentioning *Sanctification*, we must suppose *that* intended, either in *Calling*, or *Justification*, and I have always received it under *Calling*, that is Effectual Calling, or Conversion. Now a Man is converted, and he believes, and repents; but this being no Righteousness according to the Law, there comes after Calling, *Justification*, and it is that makes this imperfect Believing, Repenting, New Obedience, to become our Righteousness by *Imputation.* God's imputing it to us for Righteousness, making it by that Act, *Et Juris & Judicis*, to serve us in the room of such a Righteousness as is perfect, rewarding it for Christ's sake, as he would the other. The *having* Faith, Repentance, New Obedience, is one thing, the *having it accepted* for Righteousness is another. The one is *Regeneration*, or Sanctification, the other *Justification*, and with-

without the *one*, there cannot be the *other*. *Fides inquiunt juſtitia noſtra formalis eſſe non poteſt: Concedo* (upon his Opinion he muſt ſay ſo, not I, tho' in the Popiſh Sence I ſay *Concedo* too), *At poteſt à Deo juſtitiæ loco haberi, ut præter ipſam nihil amplius à nobis flagitet ad juſtitiam conſequendum*, ſays Mr. *Wotton*.

As for this Righteouſneſs of God now in his imputing to the Believer his Faith, or the Performance of the Evangelick Condition for Righteouſneſs, we muſt not conceive as Dr. *Owen* objects, that here is an *Imputation* only of that which is *ours*, ſo that accounting it an *imperfect Righteouſneſs*, God cannot deal with us, but only according to an *imperfect* one: When he does certainly deal with us according to a *perfect* one, and we underſtand ſo by this *Imputation*. Dr. *Owen* (who never gave the Matter its due Conſideration, nor perhaps Mr. *Baxter* neither) Philoſophizes thus. There is an Imputation to us of a thing *that is Ours*, and that is judging it Ours, and dealing with us accordingly: Or of a thing which is *not Ours*, and that is by a Donation of it on ſome juſt Ground, and dealing with us according to it *made Ours*. Of this he makes the Application, that our Righteouſneſs cannot, but Chriſt's muſt, be that which is imputed to our Juſtification. But I will Philoſophize otherwiſe, and ſo may any that * pleaſe. As there is therefore an imputing to a Perſon that *which is His*, or that *which is not His*: So is there an imputing alſo to a Perſon that which is *partly His*, and *partly not His*, but that which in the Effect may become *His too* by the Imputation. Such is the Caſe here, but never ſunk in the Doctor's Mind. There are two things in the matter I have ſaid before from *Luther*, *Our Faith*, and *God's Imputation*. Our Faith, or the Evangelick Condition performed which is *Ours*, and God's Imputation which brings with it (in the *Effect* I ſay) that which was *not Ours*, that is the Satisfaction and Merits of Chriſt (his Satisfaction for Pardoning the Failings, and his Merit for accepting that which is done though imperfect) to the accounting us righteous, and dealing with us no otherwiſe than if we were perfect. *A Man that has not a legal ſinleſs Perfection (for that is meant by the Ungodly*, Rom. 4. 5.) *his Faith is accounted for Righteouſneſs, that is, his Faith ſhall avail him as much to all intents, and ſtand him in as much ſtead as a perfect ſinleſs Righteouſneſs would do*, ſays Sir *Charles Woleſley* in his

* When ever we read of Imputing or Accounting to a Man a thing that is good, it is an Act of Grace, and Law-acceptilation, and ſignifies ſomething which is not. *Truman's Endeavour*, p. 222.

Book of *Evangelical Juſtification.* This is moſt certain, that there is no Grace vouchſafed to a Sinner from God, in order to Life, but upon the Account of Chriſt's Satisfaction and Merit, againſt the *Socinian:* When this exceeding Grace and Favour therefore that an imperfect Righteouſneſs is accepted in the room of a perfect one (as is intended in this expreſs Scripture, that ſays, Our *Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs*), the Satisfaction and Merits of Chriſt muſt be ſuppoſed as its Foundation: And conſequently they are *imputed to our Faith* for *its* Acceptation, as we ſay they are *imputed to us* for *Ours.* That *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed to us,* we aſſume without Scripture, but this is expreſs that *Righteouſneſs is imputed,* and that our *Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs*; and it will be ſtrange if any ſhall queſtion an Imputation of Chriſt's Merit to our *Duty* when it is accepted, and accepted only through him. Our Diſſenting Brethren in their Printed *Agreement* (*Dec.* 1692.) have theſe Words. *God looking on the Good Works of Believers in his Son, is pleaſed to accept and reward that which is ſincere, though accompanied with many Weakneſſes and Imperfections.* I quote theſe Words not as rare, but as the common Judgment, to ſhew, that an Imputation of Chriſt's Merit to our Duty, is undeniable. Here are the Believers *Works,* and that is our imperfect inchoate Obedience, and this *accepted,* and it is *accepted in Chriſt,* that muſt be through his Satisfaction and Merit, and is *rewarded* too upon his Account. What is there more in the accepting our Perſons in Juſtification? *Our maimed Righteouſneſs is accepted to Salvation as if it were perfect* (ſays one Dr. *Owen* cites) *for that it ſhould be ſo, Chriſt hath merited by his moſt perfect Righteouſneſs.* When this unnamed Author ſays, *As if it were perfect,* he accounts it, it is not ſo *Legally,* or *In ſe,* but *Evangelically,* or *quoad Effectum*; that is, it ſtands us in the ſtead of a *perfect one,* through the Merits of Chriſt. And unto this ſaying of his (whoſoever he be) does that *Elder* in the *Revelations* well accord, who tells St. *John,* that the *Robes* of the Saints, which are their inherent Grace, their Good Works or Holy Life, are *made white* (that is rewardable with Glory) by their *waſhing them in the Blood of the Lamb.* We are *accepted in the Beloved,* that is, *in Chriſt.* We are accepted in Chriſt no otherwiſe than our Duty is accepted, that is, as the Meritorious Cauſe of that Acceptance. The Satisfaction and Merit of Chriſt, is that upon the Account whereof God does juſtifie us: But if Chriſt's Righteouſneſs it ſelf be imputed to us, it is not *Meritorie* upon the

Ac-

Account thereof, but *Formaliter*, that we are juſtified by it.

Before I yet quite leave Mr. *Wotton*, there are two Texts moſt commonly urged by thoſe that define Juſtification only by Remiſſion, which I muſt ſpeak to, not ſtopping at Human Argument unbacked with Authority of Scripture.

The one is, *Acts* 13. 38. *Be it known unto you Men and Brethren, that through this Man is preached to you Forgiveneſs of Sins. And by him all that believe are juſtified from all things from which ye could not be juſtified* by the *Law of Moſes*. For this Text I have forelaid a Diſtinction with ſome Reference in my Mind to it. There is a double *Remiſſion* I have ſaid, a Remiſſion that *precedes* Juſtification, and a Remiſſion that *comes after* it. That which goes before Juſtification belongs to All but upon Condition, and that is this *Remiſſion*, which in the former Verſe of the two is *Preached* by the Apoſtle, A Univerſal Conditional Remiſſion, and all one with Redemption. This now being Preached to all, ſome believe, and perform the Condition, and as it follows in the other Verſe, are accordingly *juſtified*, and then this *General Conditional* Pardon before Preached becomes *Abſolute*, or *Actual* to ſuch *Particular* Perſons, and they are thereby free from the Guilt and Puniſhment of all their Sins whatſoever, even ſuch as there was no Attonement allowed to be made by the *Law of Moſes*. The Law, or Covenant of the Goſpel promiſes *Pardon* and *Life* upon Condition. He that performs the Condition hath Right to the one and the other, but a Man muſt be Juſtified before he is Glorified, and therefore before pardoned alſo. There is a Pardon procured by Chriſt, granted and paſſed by God (we muſt ſuppoſe as an Act of Grace paſſing in Parliament). This Pardon is given out orderly. The Condition muſt be performed, the Judge find it, and then the Man hath the Benefit. This aforeſaid Diſtinction therefore is exemplified in this Text, and ſeeing there is no Particular Actual Pardon, 'till Man's Believing, and God's Juſtification (which is his accounting or declaring him a Believer) do orderly intervene, as to the Courſe of the Nature of the Thing, it is plain, that *Remiſſion* (this Remiſſion as well as the other) is not *Juſtification itſelf*, but a Benefit of the Covenant, that as *Conditional* goes before, but as *Actual*, or *Abſolute* (which is that a Particular Man enjoys) does follow Juſtification (I muſt ſay ſtill) as the *Effect* of it.

The

The other Text is in *Rom.* 4. where *Paul* ſhewing that it is not by Works, but by Faith that we are juſtified after *Abraham's* Example, he lays down this Poſition, That *not to him that worketh, but believeth, his Faith is accounted for Righteouſneß:* And then in the next Verſe coming to bring Proof from *David*, he uſhers it in theſe Words, *Even as David alſo deſcribed the Bleſſedneß of that Man unto whom God imputeth Righteouſneß without Works*, whereby it is plain indeed, that he intends the ſame thing by *God's counting to a Man his Faith for Righteouſneß*, and *imputing to him Righteouſneß without Works* (that is, ſuch Works, Meritorious Works, Perfect Works, which *Paul* in the Verſes before undoubtedly intends): But it is not ſo in the Quotation itſelf, which thus follows, *Bleſſed are they whoſe Iniquities are forgiven, and Sins covered. Bleſſed is the Man to whom the Lord will not impute Sin.* It is a miſtake here in thoſe many, who think this *Non-imputation of Sin* in this Verſe, is the ſame with the *imputing Righteouſneſs without Works*, and *Faith for Righteouſneß* in the former. St. *Paul* does intend indeed thoſe two before for one, but this he intends only for a Probation. He proves that God imputes Righteouſneſs to a Man without Works, or Faith for Righteouſneſs, by this Medium that they are *bleſſed who are forgiven.* Now however theſe Words are conſtrued, this is no *Definition* of Juſtification by Faith without Works, but I ſay a *Probation.* The Man is bleſſed whoſe Sin is pardoned; The Man therefore hath Sin to be forgiven; He that hath Sin, hath not Works (ſuch as *Paul* ſpeaks of) to juſtifie him; If the bleſſed Man then be a juſtified Man, it is evident thereupon, that it is not by Works one is juſtified. However, from a Probation, this Identity cannot be argued. *They are bleſſed*, in one Verſe, *to whom Righteouſneſs is imputed without Works. They are bleſſed*, in another, *to whom God imputeth not Sin. Ergo*, Non-imputation of Sin, and imputing Righteouſneſs without Works are the ſame. I deny the Argument. *Bleſſed are they that hear the Word, and keep it. Bleſſed are they whoſe Sins are forgiven. Ergo*, Hearing and obeying the Word is Forgiveneſs of Sin. But leaving ſuch Puſhpin of *Pro* and *Con*, I will take up with this. That which is made a *Medium*, or the *Medius Terminus*, to prove another thing, cannot be that thing (or intended for the ſame thing) that it proves: And ſeeing the Quotation out of the Pſalmiſt [*The Man is bleſſed whoſe Sins are forgiven*] is brought by the Diſputant for a Probation of his Point in hand that a Man is juſtified by Faith,

Faith, and not by Works, I am ſufficiently perſwaded, that *Non-imputation of Sin*, or *Pardon* is not intended by him to be the ſame thing with *Juſtification*. If any require more Conſideration in regard to theſe two Texts, let him read a Book called, *The Chriſtian Juſtification ſtated*. I need ſay no more but thus much, which is not ſaid there, or throughly comprehended by that Author.

I know indeed, and will not paſs it, that Mr. *Truman*, a Man of a bright Judgment, defines Juſtification as Mr. *Wotton*, by Pardon only, and ſays that *Juſtification* is no more, or hath no more in it than *Pardon*, and therefore is all one with it. This, in regard to the common Opinion, which ſays it is more (defining it by the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, as well as Forgiveneſs of Sin) is to the purpoſe. But what if I ſay *Pardon* is more than *Juſtification*, then is it nothing to me. For whether Juſtification be more than Pardon, or Pardon more than Juſtification, if *one* be more than the *other*, they are not the *ſame*. Now Pardon is a Fruit or Benefit of Juſtification, and a *Thing alone* is not ſo much as the *Thing and its Benefit*. Pardon and Life makes up Salvation, for Salvation from Wrath is Pardon, and to Glory is Life, but *Salvation* coming after, is a farther Bleſſing, and more indeed than *Juſtification* only. *Pardon*, Mr. *Truman* ſays farther (of all Sins, he means, both of Omiſſion and Commiſſion) *puts a Man in that State as if he had offended the Law in nothing, and that is all one with a State as if he had performed the Law in every thing*, and therefore Pardon and Juſtification are the ſame. Our Divines he oppoſes deny theſe States to be one. Though they be *conſequentially* one, they are in their *Nature* different. Pardon is of the *Guilty*: Juſtification of him that pleads *Not Guilty*. But I will ſuppoſe Mr. *Truman* in the right, and that Pardon puts a Man in a State as if he had treſpaſſed in nothing (which *Quoad reatum pœnæ* is true), and conſequently as if he had obeyed in all things, And *therefore* do I deny Juſtification to be Pardon, becauſe the *Formal Righteouſneſs* of our Juſtification, which is the *Righteouſneſs of Faith* only *imputed to us for Righteouſneſs*, is not a Righteouſneſs that hath offended in nothing, and obeyed in every thing, as Mr. *Truman* deſcribes Pardon, but is an inchoate imperfect Righteouſneſs, that hath Failings covered with Chriſt's Satisfaction, and its Work done (I may ſay ſtill) accepted only through his Merit, ſo that the more acute this Man is, and the further he does go, the more he is out,

and

and muſt be, ſo long as he hath not once the Sence upon his Mind (through his whole Book called, *The Great Propitiation*, nor in his other two) of the *Righteouſneſs of God*, which the Apoſtle himſelf gives us as the Handle, and the only Handle to underſtand his Doctrine of Juſtification by.

This one thing yet is to be noted, that theſe worthy Men that define Juſtification by Pardon only, and ſay it is impoſſible that a Sinner can be juſtified, or made, and accounted righteous, any otherwiſe, do yet plead for a Perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs as neceſſary to Juſtification, as much, or more than others. Witneſs Sir *Charles Woleſley*. This now to me is a Contradiction, unleſs it be underſtood *à parte poſt* only. For, if *Pardon* only can make a *Sinner righteous*, how can there be any Perſonal Righteouſneſs preceding it? The Matter is thus. Before a Man believes and repents, he is not pardoned or made righteous by Pardon, that is certain. When a Man performs the Evangelick Condition, it is the *Evangelick Law*, (or God by it as his Inſtrument) *makes* him, or *conſtitutes* him righteous, and being thereby ſo made, God muſt account him ſo, which is all one with *imputing* that Condition performed *for Righteouſneſs*, or juſtifying him. This Conſtitutive Juſtification then proceeding in Order of *Nature*, though not in *Time*, Pardon, and Life do follow as the Fruit or Benefits of it. Note here, that when the Evangelick Law does conſtitute the Performer of the Condition *righteous*, it is *righteous Quoad hoc* only, for he is *ungodly*, that is, *Not righteous* ſtill (as I ſay before) in regard to the *Law*, but righteous as not guilty of the Accuſation of his Non-performance of the Condition of the Goſpel: So that after this Righteouſneſs *Quoad hoc*, a Univerſal Righteouſneſs of Not Guilty of any Omiſſion, or Commiſſion that brings a Man into a State as if he had offended in nothing, and fulfilled the Law in every thing, as Mr. *Truman* deſcribes Pardon, does manifeſtly appear to be a farther Benefit or Bleſſing than Juſtification *ſtrictly* taken. What may be underſtood by it *largely* taken, may be conſidered hereafter before I have done.

The Third PART.

BEfore I come to any Cloſe of my Diſcourſe, there is a matter of Four Things to be propoſed (whether by way of Queſtion, or Objection, it is indifferent), as neceſſary for the Satisfaction of ſuch as have the Reaſon, Candour, and Chriſtian Humility to ſeek it.

The Firſt is this. The Scripture, and thoſe therefore that duly preach it, does call upon all Men to believe and repent, in order to their Juſtification and Salvation, and when Faith and Repentance are required as Conditions of being juſtified, how can that which is pre-requiſite as a Condition, be made, or become the Form, Formal Cauſe, or Formal Reaſon of Juſtification? This I put firſt, becauſe I believe here, that nothing almoſt that a Scholar (who hath got *Ariſtotelian* Terms in his Head, putting his Phyſical Conſtructions on Divinity Points) is like to be more gravell'd at than at this. But it is nothing (let Terms or Words be once look'd through), for it is this is the very thing I affirm and ſtand upon, that what God hath made the *Condition* of his Covenant, and the Bleſſings thereof, and ſo of our Juſtification, before it is performed, when perform'd does become the Formal Righteouſneſs that juſtifies us. God does by that Act of Imputation (Inſtrumentally done by his Word) make our Faith which is not in itſelf a Righteouſneſs, to become our Righteouſneſs, and as it becomes a Righteouſneſs, it is made the Formal Reaſon of our Juſtification. There is the Carpenter's Work, the Bricklayer's Work, the Smith's Work, goes to the Building a Houſe: There muſt be therefore Timber, Bricks, and Iron prepared, and the preparing theſe are Conditions of the Building, or Materials, before, but when the Houſe is built, they all put together are the Houſe it ſelf, and as a Houſe, the Formal Cauſe, Formal Reaſon, or Form of it.

A Second Thing to be propoſed is this. Our Divines we know, do ordinarily bring together Remiſſion of Sin, and the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs into the Matter of our

Juſtification, and when the *Aſſembly* have given us a Definition comprizing the ſame Things I do in mine, why ſhould I offer another? Unto this I will make that Anſwer as ought to content any honeſt Man, that would have but ſuch a one as he would be allowed himſelf to give, and I ſay, that I do readily give my Suffrage to the *Aſſembly's Catechiſm* to be learned and uſed above any I know, and am not concern'd though a Learner of it be not ſo accurate in his Underſtanding as to ſee any Difference between my Definition and theirs, when what is in mine, is in theirs, and what in theirs, is in mine. I am perſwaded that a believed groſſer Knowledge of the Principles of Religion, is better for ordinary People, than that which is more exact, and I receive all that is in their Definition, only with liberty of Explication. In Juſtification I acknowledge a *Forgiveneſs*, and an *Imputation of Chriſt's Obedience*, but I do not acknowledge either as our *Formal Righteouſneſs*. I ſay, Forgiveneſs is a Benefit we receive by it, but it is not the Formal Reaſon of it: and I acknowledge Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed, *Sub genere cauſæ efficientis per modum meriti*, and ſo *received by Faith* not *in itſelf*, but in the *Merit* of it only. And I give Notice that he who thinking more does ſay, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *in ſe*, is made ours *Legally* (tho' *Phyſically* and *Morally* he diſowns it) that Man muſt make it to juſtifie us, *Sub ratione cauſæ formalis*, when perhaps he does not know it, which is an unadviſed Poſition, I look upon, as that πρῶτον ψεῦδος, of our former great Divines which gave the Riſe to *Antimonianiſm*.

A Third Thing to be propoſed is. Our Proteſtants have their Mouths full of *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed*, when the Scripture hath no ſuch Expreſſion, and what hath not Authority from Scripture, may be again refuſed, *Eadem facilitate* (ſays *Hierom*) as it hath been received. It is fit therefore this be a little examin'd into, and there may be two Queſtions ask'd. The one, What is there in the thing at bottom, as to the reality and truth of it? The other, And what then ſhall we ſay to it? For the Firſt, That which is in reality in this Matter, *The Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*, is, that Chriſt by the Appointment of his Father, and his own Good Will, did undertake in our behalf to do and ſuffer what was required of us to ſuffer by the Law, ſo far, that the Honour of God, in regard to his Law, being ſaved, and the Ends thereof ſecured, we that were liable to Damnation, might be delivered from it, in the Way or Manner

the

the Father and Son deſigned, which is by that Act of Grace promulgated in the Goſpel, that upon our believing and repenting we ſhall be juſtified, and ſo pardoned, and have Life Everlaſting. And what then ſhall we ſay thereupon, but that the very Righteouſneſs of Chriſt *In ſe*, did go into, or may be ſaid imputed unto the *Impetration* of this great Benefit for us, but the Benefit only, and not his Righteouſneſs can be ours in the *Application*. That we ſhould be juſtified by Faith, was obtained by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs or Performance, but it is *our Faith*, not *Chriſt's Performance*, is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs in our Juſtification. Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is that *for which*, not *by which*, *Cauſa propter quam*, not *Per quam*, we have this Benefit, that upon believing we are juſtified. The Application is our Work, the Impetration Chriſt's; the Imputation of what he did to us God's; And there is no ſuch thing can be, as the making that formally ours by the Application. * I have delivered my Conceptions more fully in my late Book, (*Pacif.* p. 30, 31, 32.), not without Care, but without Reſervation. There are none as yet have wrote upon it, but when Mr. *Williams*, or ſome other ſhall,

* As for the Commutation of Perſons (which while ſome Divines, as Dr. *Owen*, do found in the *Myſtical* Union, inſtead of the *Hypoſtatical*, between Chriſt and Believers, they make I know not what of it) I acknowledge ſuch a one, as is neceſſary to the *Impetration* of our Redemption, but I underſtand none ſo as to go into the *Application*. Chriſt took on him our Fleſh, made Satisfaction in our ſtead, and procured an Act of Grace, or Pardon for all: But there is no *Commutation* I know, as to *Particular* Perſons in the Point of *Juſtification*. If Chriſt made an Exchange of his *Righteouſneſs* with *Peter* for his *Sins*, any otherwiſe than as to the Impetration of Pardon on Condition that concerns all alike, then *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* muſt now be *Peter*'s, and *James*, and *John* could never have it. In Chriſt's uniting *himſelf to us*, by his taking our Nature, obeying, ſuffering, ſatisfying God's Juſtice, I acknowledge a *Commutation*, even ſuch, to wit, that our Sins were ſo imputed to him, as that he died *for them*, and *in our ſtead*, (underſtanding the Phraſes aright) and his *Righteouſneſs* ſo *imputed* as to be the *Cauſe*, that upon our believing we enjoy the *Benefit*: But in Chriſt's uniting *us to him*, by giving his *Spirit* to work in us that *Condition*, whereby we have our Right to the *Benefit*, there is nothing done by him in *our* ſtead, nothing by us in *His*, no new, no other, no farther *Imputation*. The *Fruit* of his Purchaſe (Pardon and Salvation by a Law of Grace) cannot be *His*, and if that that he communicates to us be not his, how is there a *Commutation*? Of this *Sacrifice* and *Righteouſneſs* itſelf we are uncapable: Of the *Effects* and *Fruits* (as Pardon of Sin) he is uncapable. What he hath not, he cannot communicate: What he hath, we cannot receive. There is, there can be no *Subſtitution of Perſon*, in our partaking the Benefits purchaſed, as there was, there muſt be, in the purchaſing them for us. *Pacif.* p. 16. Then *Pacif.* p. 30, 31, 32. What I have ſaid before about the Commutation of Perſons, that it is to be held in regard to the *Impetration*, not *Application* of our Redemption, I would offer over again likewiſe, in regard to the *Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*. I have ſaid, and ſaid it over, that this Phraſe is not found in Scripture, but I will acknowledge the thing in the true Sence of it, which is this. Chriſt Jeſus did really obey the Law, and ſuffer its Penalty *for us* in the Sence of, *in our place or ſtead*. To do a thing now in my ſtead, is for ano-

another to do it ſo, as to ſave me the doing it. Chriſt's ſuffering and obeying was to ſave us that ſuffering and obeying. *In what reſpect I ſhew there*——*And in the next Page I go on.* God looks not on us, as if we our ſelves had obeyed or ſuffered, either in his Perſon, or he to have done it *ſtrictly* in Ours, but that he obeyed and ſuffered *Loco noſtro*, to free us from ſo Obeying *(there ſhewn)* and ſuffering as he himſelf did, which is the making his Death and Obedience Ours only as to this Benefit. Thus much being right, and the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt conſiſting in this Obedience, and ſuffering thus in our room, what now at laſt is the *Imputation* of it? Why certainly the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is, and muſt be nothing elſe, but God's accounting the Matter to be thus as it is. Here is the Point, that what Chriſt hath done, is look'd upon, is accepted as done in our behalf, or the granting it to be ſo; that, upon this obeying and ſuffering of his in our place, as the *Meritorious Cauſe*, we ſhall be freed from the ſame, as the *Effect* of it. This is the only Fundamental Truth in the Phraſe, and this Imputation then of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs (which Man hath ſo phraſed) going into this Grant on God's part, or *Obtaining* the Grant on Chriſt's part, which precedes the *Application*, it cannot go into the *Application* itſelf (that follows after upon Performance of the Goſpel-Terms) ſo as to make Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *Ours*, any otherwiſe than in this *Benefit* only. Beſides this, the fancying ſuch Acts in God, as the imputing Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to every ſingle Perſon upon his believing, any otherwiſe than by that one Act of Grace now promulgated in the Goſpel, is not becoming the Divine Being. There is, there can be no new Act in God. He is *Actus purus*, his Will one. I muſt not grow too ſubtile here, only I muſt ſay, there is his *Will*, and the *Effects* of his Will, and in thoſe Effects there is an Order. In that Order the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt precedes the Impetration of all the Benefits we have by him, as the Meritorious Cauſe of them. The Impetration precedes the Application, and the Application can be therefore but of the Effects thereof. Not of this Righteouſneſs (I ſay) itſelf *(In ſe)* but of the Benefits themſelves we have by it. To be more ſhort. That Commutation of Perſons, and Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs (which comes both in earneſt to this one thing, *Man's Benefit upon the Account of Chriſt's Satisfaction*) howſoever the Thoughts thereof have amuſed ſo many Good Men, when you have throughly conſidered them, and made as much of them as ever you can, it muſt all of it, every Drop of it you can make, go into that Act of Grace (Salvation upon Goſpel-Conditions) which is already procured and paſſed. Unto the *Impetration* then of our Redemption Chriſt's Righteouſneſs was indeed imputed *In ſe*: In the *Application* it can be imputed only *in the Effect*.

thoſe that attend this Diſpute, ſhall be the better able to judge of it. For my part, I have put no Life or Vigour into my Notion by my Words, which are there very poor, but the plain dull Sence I am perſwaded does carry that Truth in it, as when it comes into a more Authoritative Pen may be received. This is a common thing by Experience, that let a Notion be offered by an ordinary Body, it is like to lie, but if ſome Perſon of Credit takes it up, it goes currant. I never read in any before my ſelf ſaid it in my firſt Impreſſion (about 25 Years ſince) of my *Mid. Way of Juſt.* (tho' many perhaps I know not, might have ſaid it, it being now ordinary in Pulpit and Preſs) that *Paul* by the Righteouſneſs of his *Own*, which he renounces (*Rom.* 10. 2. *Phil.* 3. 9.) muſt be underſtood of his Righteouſneſs as a *Jew*, and not of his *Chriſtian* Righteouſneſs (that is *His* own, not *Another's*

ther's own), which if he be not found in, he could not be ſaved: But after Sir *Charles Woleſley* in his Book, ſaid the ſame, I cannot but note, how that grave, learned, holy, humble, worthy, and the more worthy becauſe humble, Mr. *Samuel Cradock*, in his *Supplement to Knowledge and Practice*, upon a deeper Reflection on the Point than he ſeems to have had in his former moſt Induſtrious, Thanks-deſerving Books (his *Harmony of the Evangeliſts*, his *Apoſtolick Hiſtory*, and his *Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament*, all *Methodized*), falls in with Sir *Charles*, and acquieſcently receives the ſame Notion from him, which if he had read in me (from whom I know Sir *Charles* took it) it is ten to one, but he had paſſed it unregarded. There was Mr. *Hotchkis*, ſince that Paper of mine, and others that I could name, with Mr. *Williams*, have conſented to that Apprehenſion, but there is that Book before-named, *The Chriſtian Juſtification ſtated*, Printed 1678, hath ſo exceeding well improved it (a ſober Writer, but no Univerſity-Man) that he hath, I think, carried the Bell in it. But Mr. *Cradock* I have named more purpoſely, becauſe if any ſhall be willing to write againſt my Books, I would have him read thoſe three Pages, (*p.* 184, 185, 186.) of his Book mentioned, and when he ſhall be firſt ſeaſoned with the gracious Spirit, and modeſt Judgment of that Orthodox Author, and then find there the Doctrine of Imputation ſo throughly corrected, and an Interpretation of theſe Texts (2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Phil.* 3. 9. *Rom.* 5. 19.) ſo perfectly concordant with what I have wrote, it may be enough to calm him if furious, if but contrary minded to ſatisfie him. And nevertheleſs Mr. *Cradock* is out as to one thing by following Sir *Charles*, which is in his making Juſtification to be all one with Remiſſion of Sin, as Mr. *Hotchkis*, after Mr. *Wotton* hath done, who made it (I have ſhewn) the *Formal Righteouſneſs* of our Juſtification. Mr. *Bradſhaw*, who wrote after Mr. *Wotton*, and ſaw what he had wrote (as I believe by his Epiſtle to his excellent little *Treatiſe*) tells us on the contrary, that *Pardon* and *Juſtification* are *two* things, and ſo diverſe in their Nature, that he who hath committed a Fault, if he be *pardoned* without making amends, he cannot be *juſtified*.

I have therefore a Laſt Thing to be propoſed, which will take up more room, and it is this. Our Divines, myſelf, and all agree againſt the *Socinian* about Chriſt's Satisfaction, that it is upon Acc[illegible]t thereof we are juſtified, and how then can it be by our Faith, and the Imputation thereof for Righteouſneſs,

as

as I have defined Justification? Here the Business I have now left me to do, is to shew the concurrence of Faith, which is our Evangelical Righteousness, and Christ's Satisfaction which was *his* (but not *our*) Legal Righteousness, without any inconsistency as to both in our Justification. And this I must say is no hard Matter to do, seeing the true Conception lies in the Thoughts of most considerate Men, only for want of a more fixt and resolved Judgment the Vacillation remains. To proceed in it, I must return to Mr. *Bradshaw* where I left. He hath told us, That if a Fault be charged on a Person, that Man cannot be justified but by the Plea, either that the thing was not done by him, or if done, it was no fault, which is pleading Not Guilty, as *David* was justified by *Saul*; or by pleading that Amends is made for the Fault. Now Amends may be made either by one's self, or by another: And by another, either as one whom he hath got to do it, or one that does it of his own accord: Where Satisfaction is made by a Man's Self, or by one he hath got to do it (which we must conceive done to the same End as himself would have done it) a Man is to be accounted to be restored into the same State, in regard to the Party offended, as he was before the Fault was committed, that is, to be immediately justified, made righteous, or clear of the Fault: But it is not so, where Satisfaction is neither made by a Man's self, nor by any means of his Procurement (only another out of Pity and Compassion to him, hath agreed with the offended Party, and by a valuable Consideration for the Fault hath satisfied him), for here the Person for whom Satisfaction is made, is not justifiable any otherwise, but as the Person that made the Satisfaction for him did intend, together with the offended Party, who might have refused that Satisfaction, so that they may agree both upon Terms to be imposed on the Party offending for reaping the benefit of that Satisfaction. This is the Case between God, Christ, and Us. We sinned, Our selves could make no Amends, nor did any thing to procure Christ to do it. Christ hath done it voluntarily, but with the Intent, and by his Father's Agreement, that we shall repent and believe, and be judged true penitent Believers (which is justifying us) before we are Partakers of the Benefit intended. We are not to conceive of this Matter any otherwise, for this is the Tenour of the New Covenant procured by our Redeemer hereby. On our part, Faith, Repentance, is required as the Condition: On God's part the Benefits of

Christ's

Christ's Satisfaction are promised: Upon our sincere believing God judges us Performers: That Performance he imputes to us for Righteousness: Upon the Account of Christ's Merits it is done, and the Benefits are conferred, which are freedom from Punishment, and Eternal Salvation.

As for the Imputation now of Christ's Satisfaction to the Believer, which must be allowed so far as our being justifiable thereupon does import, we are to understand farther, that it is not necessary that what is imputed to the Justification of another, should be reputed as done by him that is justified, tho' what is imputed is accepted for that he should have done, that is accepted in the room or place of it, which I have been careful to keep to, in my last Sheets; Nay, tho' I say farther, that when the Satisfaction of another is imputed to the Justification of a Man, the Trespasses of that other, after a sort must be said imputed to him, and yet neither is that Satisfaction *Formaliter* made his that is justified, nor that Trespass *Formaliter* made his that makes the Satisfaction, but *Effective* or *Meritorie* only, in the one's bearing the Punishment, and the other obtaining the Benefit of it. This being understood, when our Divines do account that we are justified by Christ's Satisfaction so as to be made just by it, and accordingly to be made righteous by the Righteousness of another, which is being made just by Imputation: Such Words (I count) ought to be a little changed, and the Sence verified. It should not be said *by*, but *through* Christ's Satisfaction, *through* his Righteousness, *through* the Imputation of it, and then that Truth which is in it is this, that through Christ's Satisfaction or Righteousness, or Imputation of it as the *Meritorious Cause* (which we know is an external Cause moving the Efficient to act) we are indeed justified, but by no means must we understand them so, as that it is the *Formal Cause* of our Justification.

But the truth is here, that our former Polemical Divines (even the chief) in opposition to a Man's being justified by any Works, Merits, or Righteousness of his own, maintain'd against the Papists, that it is by Christ's Righteousness, *Sub genere causæ formalis*, that we are justified, or that Christ's Righteousness is so made ours by Faith, as to be the *Formal Reason* of our Justification. Our excellent Dr. *Davenant* undertook this Task (whosoever in those times did not), but where the Scripture is for us, we are to trust no Mortal against it. The Question as he proposes it is, *Quæ*

&

& qualis illa juſtitia ſit quæ coram Deo hominem juſtificat, hoc eſt, cujus intuitu ipſe Deus hominem à peccato & pœna peccati liberum pronunciet, atque favore ſuo & vita æterna dignum reputet. Let us define the Thing by its Form, and ſpeak this *Hoc eſt* in ſhort, *Cujus intuitu hominem credentem juſtum reputat.* Now *Cujus intuitu*, all know is all one with *Id propter quod*, that is the Meritorious Cauſe only, when he would maintain that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the *Cauſa formalis*, that is *Cauſa per quam*, we are juſtified. He therefore being put to it is forced to affirm thus, *In Juſtificatione talis formalis cauſa ponenda eſt quæ ſimul & meritoria eſſe poſſit.* His Reaſon for it is out of the ſame Quiver, that is, more Words for the bearing out an abſurd Affirmation, by putting ſome Face upon it. I am ſufficiently aſſured he hath ſhot beyond the Mark, and I will not go after his Arrow. By the way, there are two places I remember, where we are ſaid to be juſtified by Chriſt's Blood, but it is Ἐν αἵματι, and ſhould be tranſlated, *through his Blood*, and muſt be interpreted no otherwiſe than *Cujus intuitu*, that is, as the *Meritorious Cauſe*, I ſay, not as by *Faith* in his Blood, which is the *Formal Cauſe* of our Juſtification. When we ſpeak therefore and allow our Divines to ſpeak of the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs as they ordinarily do, we muſt underſtand them ſo as never to make our ſelves the *Proprietors* of that righteouſneſs (*Legally*, or any way elſe impoſſible), or that Faith ſo makes it ours as to be our *Formal Righteouſneß* (which when we ſee ſuch great Divines have held, no wonder if the leſſer Fry do ſwallow), but that it is the Cauſe *for which* (as I have ſaid before) not the Cauſe *by which* we are juſtified. And here I will give Mr. *Williams* Notice, that this is the Reaſon why *the very Righteouſneß of Chriſt* cannot be *imputed* to us but in the *Effects*, becauſe I ſay that if it were imputed to us *In ſe*, it muſt (according to our oppoſite Brethren) be then our *Formal Righteouſneß*, which he and I are to deny. I muſt confeſs, I think Mr. *Williams* might not have ſo fully digeſted this before, (as likewiſe myſelf) as he may now, and that the Expreſſion of his which I have exagitated in my Book, with that which follows in his, that *Chriſt's Righteouſneß is pleadable by the Believer, as if himſelf had done and ſuffered what Chriſt did*; as alſo, *To impute to one what is ſuffered by another, is to eſteem the one undertaker for in the Sufferings of the other, and to deal with him as if himſelf had ſuffered*, are ſhot too high. For if a Man had made Satisfaction himſelf, or God did impute Chriſt's Satisfaction to him, ſo as if himſelf had

had made it, then were this his *Formal Righteousness*, and there were no need of that of *Faith*, this alone being that which must immediately justifie him. If therefore there be such a thing to be expected ever from Mr. *Williams*, as any *Vestigia retrorsum*, I will be ready to look for the Prints thereof made in the Words I have quoted, as well as his Brethren may in any others.

But the Difficulty concerning the Point of the Concurrence of Christ's Righteousness and Ours in the matter of Justification is not yet off our hands: For there is a *Sermon* of Mr. *Gibbons*, that Mr. *Baxter* often commended, which I think fit to mention. This Gentleman hath treated the Doctrine of Justification as I. Righteousness (says he) is a Conformity to the Law: A Man is actually justified, when he is constituted righteous. The New Law runs thus, He that believes shall not perish: The Believer keeps or fulfils this Law: Faith therefore is imputed to him for Righteousness: The Law-Giver by his very making the Law constitutes him righteous, and the Judge must pronounce him so. The Gospel then justifies *Qua lex Lata*, Faith justifies *Vi Legis latæ*: As the King's Stamp gives the Value to the Money. I let this together, and quote it for the clearness of it, and my approbation to it. Nevertheless he tells us also, That it is *Christ's Satisfaction in respect to the Law of Works that is our proper Legal Righteousness, and I call it* (says he) *Our Righteousness, because it becomes imputed to us upon believing*. These are Words that in appearance are Ambidextrous, *holding with the Hound, and running with the Hare*, as the Proverb is, unless we put an Understanding upon them, which I am not sure that very ingenuous (but young) Man did. As likewise such Words (or Sence) as Mr. *Williams* hath somewhere concerning this double Righteousness, Christ's and Ours, accounting the one the *Principal*, and the other *Subordinate* to it. Now, if Mr. *Gibbons*, or Mr. *Williams*, hitherto should have conceived our Righteousness we call *Evangelical*, to be *Subordinate* to Christ's, which was *His* (but not *Our*) *Legal* Righteousness, *Sub ratione ejusdem causæ*, they are Mired: But when thus much is forelaid, that Christ's Righteousness does concur to our Justification only, *Sub genere, sub ratione*, or *Per modum causæ efficientis Meritoriæ*, and not *Per modum causæ formalis*, it is but understanding that the *Meritorious* Cause in our Justification is preferred before, or valued above the *Formal* (which without the Virtue of that were none) by such Expressions, and if any be in the Mire, they may come out. Mr. *Gibbons* for explaining him-

himself; supposes us as if we stood at a double Bar, the Bar of the *Law*, and the Bar of the *Gospel*. At the one it is *Reason Objects* that Faith justifies: At the other it justifies *Formaliter*. As to the one *Faith*, (says he) *lays hold on Christ's Satisfaction, which is our Legal Righteousness: As to the other, Faith itself is keeping Covenant* (understand *Quoad fœderis Conditionem*) *or fulfilling the Gospel*. Very fine, I must profess all, if Faith indeed made Christ's Legal Righteousness to be *Formaliter* Ours (as it is *Formaliter*, our Evangelical itself) which formerly our great Divines apprehended, but were exceedingly out, and wounded our Cause. It cannot be that this Righteousness should any otherwise be ours than *Per modum Meriti*, that is only in the Effects. And in this Sence (*Non formaliter*, but *Effective*) must that Expression be understood, *The Lord our Righteousness*, if by *the Lord*, Christ personally be intended: If not, *Hominis Justitia est Dei indulgentia*, does give the true and full Sence of it.

I must confess I am at a stand about this Gentleman's two Bars. That all Men who hear the *Gospel* shall be judged by it, I hold for certain, upon the Account (if we had no more for it) that Christ sent out his Apostles to declare to the World in his Name, That *He that believes shall be saved, and He that believes not shall be damned*. The Believer is one freed from the Law, and cannot be brought therefore to its Bar. *He that believes shall not come into Judgment. If we walk after the Spirit, we are not under the Law. There is no Condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. We are not under the Law, but under Grace*. These are plain Texts as to the *Believer*, and as for the *Unbeliever* we know he is *condemned already*, and there needs no bringing him afresh to the same Bar. One Bar will serve both, where the Grand Inquest will be this only, whether or no we have performed the Condition of the Gospel. They that have, are acquitted; they that have not, are left under that *Condemnation*. To wave this therefore any farther than it is of Concern, let me recur to the *Legal Righteousness* Mr. *Gibbons* speaks of (and Mr. *Williams* accordingly) which he counts we must have together with our *Evangelical* to justifie us, and therefore I will shew, that if he mean it in the common Sence, and Sence of others, that he is out, and that he is in a mistake. I will shew that those that speak thus according to the common Apprehensions of the Protestants, that they are first out, and then I will shew their Mistake, and set them right.

That

That they are out I shew first. By this *Legal Righteousness* what they understand we sufficiently know, that is the *Righteousness of Christ* made theirs in a *Legal Sence*, to wit, though the Righteousness of one cannot become another's *Naturally*, or *Morally*, yet *Legally* the common Opinion is, that Christ's Righteousness is every true Believers. Here then let us distinguish of this *Legal Righteousness*, in respect to the *Preceptive* or *Retributive* part of the Law. As to the *Preceptive* part of it, I do avouch with Mr. *Baxter*, that no Man or Woman is, or ever hath (except Christ himself) been justified by the Performance thereof, either by himself, or by another in his *Civil Person*, as fully representing him. For *if we are reputed such* (says Mr. *Baxter*) *as have fulfilled the Law, there is no room for Christ's Suffering, for Repentance, for Faith in his Blood, for Pardon, or Prayer for it, or for any Duty which supposeth Sin, as Sacraments, and other Ordinances, and so the Gospel is subverted*, as he still tells us. And as for the *Retributive* part of the Law I must say no less, that if we are reputed in Christ to have born the Penalty, or his bearing it be indeed our *Legal* Righteousness, then must our *Evangelical* be made needless, for when we are free from all Guilt, both of Omission and Commission, so that we are as righteous as we can be made already, there is no more to be imposed, or can be, in order to our being justified or saved, and so the Gospel is subverted also. Not that Mr. *Baxter*, or I, deny the Righteousness of Christ, as to the *Retributive* part of the Law to be imputed, no, nor that of his as to the *Preceptive* part (seeing his Satisfaction consists in both) but that neither are otherways imputed than as I say before, *Per modum meriti*, as to the Effects, and to give it in Mr. *Baxter's* own Words, *Imputed so as that we have it in the relation of a Meritorious Cause, to the End, or Use which God accepts it for, and hath assigned in the Gospel.*

That they mistake, and how they mistake (to make it out, and make it up) I must shew next. That Christ obeyed the Law and suffered the Penalty for us, so as what he did and suffered was in our behalf, in our stead, room, or place, is by us all acknowledged. What is done or suffered in another's stead (we are then to understand) is done or suffered to free the other from doing or suffering the same, which else he should, as I have stood upon it in my other Sheets. Thus the *Beast* died, instead of the *Sacrificer* of it. Whereas then this *Legal Righteousness* which the common Opinion *supposes*, must be *Ours* to justifie us, was

performed by Christ in our room or stead, that we might *not our selves* perform it, how manifestly are they of that Opinion mistaken, in that *Supposition!* Christ did perfectly fulfil the Precept of the Law, that such a perfect fulfilling of it might not be required of us as the Condition of *Life*, as by the Law it was: Christ did undergo the Penalty that we might not our selves suffer it, and be damned. The Satisfaction then of Christ (which contains both) cannot *In se* be imputed to us, or reputed as *Our* Satisfaction, because then it must not be in our room, or place, that he satisfied, nor God accounted that he did. God does impute to us his Sufferings that we might not suffer, and therefore does not look on us as having suffered: He does impute to us his fulfilling the Law that we might not be put to it to fulfil it our selves (and yet have the Reward as much as if we had, where is Imputation still we see only *Quoad fructus & effectus*), and therefore looks not on us as if we had performed it. Here is the Mercy of God, and happy Mistake of these Men. A *Legal* Righteousness is imposed on his Son, that an *Evangelical* only, may be accepted from *Men*. A perfect one offered for us to God, that our inchoate and imperfect one may be imputed to us for Righteousness through him; and that is to make it serve the turn, as that a perfect one would have done, if we could have performed it. *Faith is really* (says Mr. *Baxter*) *the Condition of the Covenant of Grace, which who so performeth, he is righteous against the Charge of Non-performance of that Condition: And supposing Christ's Merits, and our Redemption by him, this Gospel-Righteousness is all that is required of us on our parts, instead of all that perfect Obedience which the Law of Innocency required.* Let Mr. *Williams* therefore be here perswaded that there is no making Christ's Righteousness *Ours*, any otherwise than in the *Effects*: Yet let him believe too, that Christ's Righteousness is made Ours in the Effects (for the Effects are Ours): And this is one Effect wherein it is made Ours, that *our Faith is imputed to us for Righteousness*; and also, that consequently there needs no perfect one *In se*, to be imputed, because this imperfect one is instead of one, or as good to us as one, by that Imputation. But if Christ's Righteousness was *Legally Ours*, or imputed to us otherwise than in the *Effects* then could not our Faith be imputed to us for Righteousness, that is instead of a perfect one, because a perfect one were imputed to us already in Christ.

That

That there are two Righteouſneſſes concur in our Juſtification I am ſatisfied with Mr. *Baxter*, but when he ſtands off only to be *ſubordinate* to the other, or *ſubſervient*, I cannot but hear Dr. *Owen* objecting, That upon this Suppoſition *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is made to ſerve *Ours* (which elſe could not be imputed for Righteouſneſs), and therefore *Ours* is not ſubſervient to *That*. It is neceſſary therefore for us to keep in our Minds, that our Righteouſneſs, and Chriſt's, concur in our Juſtification, but not on the ſame Account, not under the reaſon of the *ſame*, but *diverſe* Cauſes, and therefore if they be held *Co-ordinate*, I ſee no hurt, ſo long as they are not *Co-equal*, the one being of infinite Value, and giving Virtue to the other. If as there are two Righteouſneſſes, we conceive with Mr. *Gibbons*, two Bars, two Juſtifications, that is, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is our Legal Righteouſneſs, and the Formal Cauſe of our *Legal* Juſtification, and our Faith, or Evangelick Righteouſneſs, the Formal Cauſe of our *Evangelical* Juſtification, there were no queſtion in making one Righteouſneſs and Juſtification ſubordinate, or ſubſervient to the other Righteouſneſs and Juſtification: But if Mr. *Williams* when he ſays, *The very Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to a Believer beſides the Effects*; and Mr. *Gibbons* apprehended the Matter ſo, we are to know Mr. *Baxter* muſt not apprehend with them; who teaches, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is not imputed *in ſe*, and conſequently is never to be allowed our *Formal Righteouſneſs* in regard to the *Law*, or *Goſpel*. It is ſomething hard therefore for me to ſet this right, only thus much we know and ſay with Mr. *Baxter*, that Chriſt by his Obedience and Sufferings hath obtained a Grant of *Impunity* and *Life* for Sinners, which he gives upon Terms; we performing thoſe Terms, have a *Right* to thoſe Benefits; And ſo a *Righteouſneſs* by that *Right*; Hereof Chriſt's Righteouſneſs being the meritorious procuring Cauſe, his Righteouſneſs is ſaid to be *Ours*, in regard to *that Effect*: But there being other Effects of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs beſides theſe, and this one more eſpecially, that Our *Faith*, or the Evangelick Condition, is upon that Account *imputed for Righteouſneſs*, which elſe were none, how is it, that our Evangelical Perſonal Righteouſneſs can be ſaid ſubordinate, ſubſervient to, or required in order for the obtaining of the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, when we have it already as to *that Effect*, or in that *Imputation*? It appears to me therefore not unfit to ſay here, that the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, and the *Performance of the Evangelick Condition*, do concur

to

to our Justification as to the Form of it, which is the imputing to us that Evangelick Condition performed for Righteousness, in a *Co-ordination* of diverse Causes as to *that Effect*, but in a *Subordination* as to the *Effects* or *Benefits*, both of Christ's Righteousness and Justification, *that follow*.

The Fourth PART.

I Know in this Discourse of the *Righteousness of God*, I do assert that which our Protestants hitherto have denied (but scarce taken into their Thoughts to examine, with the *Bereans*, whether it be so or no) to wit, that *Faith* (which is a living working Faith) is our *Formal Righteousness*, the reason of their denial having been much, because they have confounded the *Causa per quam*, and *Propter quam*, and spoken of them as one, as appears by *Davenant* before quoted, and others, their meaning in the Main being only, that it is not *our* Righteousness but *Christ's*, which is *Id propter quod*, or *Cujus merito*, we are justified, unto which we all agree. But it is time if they have understood otherwise to set the Matter right now. By Faith, says the Scripture again and again, we are justified. *By* is, *Id per quod*, the *Causa formalis*, and I avert accordingly, that it is *Formaliter*, or *Per modum Causæ formalis*; that by Faith we are justified. And why should I not stick to that the Scripture does so expressly warrant? *Davenant* that here is quite opposite, and holds, that it is Christ's Righteousness which does *Formaliter*, justifie us, does yet acknowledge that we are in Scripture still denominated, or accounted righteous by God, in regard to our Evangelical Righteousness, and never in regard to Christ's. Now *Justificari* is *Justum esse censeri*. *Justi autem censemur* (according to him) *à justitia inchoata*, and yet *Ab inchoata justitia non justificamur*, but *à justitia Christi imputata*. *Justi censemur* (says he) *à justitia inchoata: Justificati dicimur à justitia perfectissima Christi imputata*. What is this, but Apparent Conviction, and Authoritative Tergiversation? There are two Reasons I find move our Protestants. One is, they are startled by a Word, the Word *Cause*, they will not have our Works, nor Faith, as a Work, to justifie, because that makes

makes it a Cause of our Justification, which to avoid they will call it a *Condition* only. Now a *Condition*, being *Cause sine qua non*, does make our Evangelick Righteousness as necessary (so as we cannot be justified without it) as the making it a *Cause* does. And I find it no regret in my Mind to call it a Cause, as well as a Condition, for it is both, only we must consider what Cause we make it. If we made our Works, or Faith, as a Work, to justifie us, *Sub genere Causæ Efficientis*, it must be that which is Procatarctick, and so the *Meritorious Cause* thereof, which were to bring our Works, or Faith, into the Office of Christ's Righteousness, and to derogate from Grace, a thing we utterly disclaim: But when we make it the *Formal Cause* only (of our *Passive* Justification), we do nothing thereby, but advance God's Grace, and Christ's Merits, as having obtained for us, not only that God should require of us no other Condition but our Faith, or this inchoate Righteousness unto Life, but also that he should constitute by his *New Law* this Condition performed to be our Righteousness in the room of that perfect one required by the *Old*: So that, as *Adam*, if he had perfectly obeyed, his Obedience had been his *Formal Righteousness*, in regard to the *Law*, so is this, *Ours*, in regard to the *Gospel*. The other Reason then of their denial, is, the Supposition that both Protestants and Papists have gone upon, to wit, that the *Law* is the Rule of that *Righteousness*, which they on both sides contend for as the *Formal Reason* of their Justification. And upon this Account they both of them are out, for the Papist on one side speaks up for inherent Grace, and his Works done by it, so as he would have them Meritorious and Perfect (for the Papist pleads for *Merit* and *Perfection*), but he can never bring them up to answer the Law, seeing he must still pray, *Enter not into Judgment*, and *forgive us our Trespasses*, and therefore the Protestant denies, that our Faith, or Works, are any *Formal Righteousness* that can justifie us, and I say the same in the Sence they understand one another, for our inchoate Obedience cannot be so, when the *Law* is made the *Rule* of it: On the other side, the Protestant pleads therefore for Christ's Righteousness, which is a Righteousness indeed that answers the Rule (they both make so), but this Righteousness being without us, though it be upon the Account thereof, *Id propter quod*, or *Cujus merito*, we are justified, the Papist says stiffly it can never be made Formally Ours, so as to be *Id per quod*, we are justified, and I must say the same, for Truth is Truth, and

Ab-

Absurdity is Absurd, whether on one side or the other. The Supposition then, the Ground on which they go, being a Mistake, it must be rectified. Let us understand therefore here, that there is a double Rule, a Rule of *Life*, and a Rule of *Judgment*, there is *Norma Officii*, and *Norma Judicii*, as I have it in my *Pacification*, and although the *Law of Works* be the Rule of *Life* or *Duty*, and being the *Law of Nature* it must abide so for ever, yet Jesus Christ having perfectly obeyed it in our stead, for the freeing us from it (in regard to its *Condition*), it is relaxed (as I shew there) through Grace, and the *Gospel* made the Rule of *Judgment*, and consequently of that *Righteousness* which is the *Formal Cause* of our Justification. Christ's Obedience was perfect according to Law, but it is not by the *Law* that God pronounces the Believer righteous. *The Law is not of Faith*, and *Righteousness cometh not by the Law*. If it be by the *Gospel* then, not by the *Law* God pronounces a Man righteous, it is not by the *Righteousness of Christ imputed*, which is a Righteousness according to the *Law*, but by the Evangelick Condition performed, which is a Righteousness accordingly (accepted through the Merit and Satisfaction of Christ) that the Believer is justified. *Inter Protestantes certum est fidem etiam vivam non esse justitiam illam per quam coram severo Dei Judicio stamus*, says *Le Blanc*. This is true, I have just now acknowledged, but I wonder that this very considerate Man should never come to understand that, that *severe Judgment* of God he speaks of, is the Judgment of God according to the *Law*, and that we stand not at that *Judgment*. I acknowledge again, that at that Judgment our inchoate inherent Grace is not any *Formal Righteousness*, or the *Justitia per quam*, we can stand there: But there is a *Paternal Judgment* of God according to the *Gospel*, and at this *Judgment* our Faith is the Righteousness, *Per quam*, or Formal Righteousness by which we are justified. If here you will conceive of two Bars, you must not conceive of them as before, so as if after you are justified upon a Personal Righteousness, you must come to another to be justified by Christ's, but you must conceive of the Bar of the *Law* as erected first. There was but two Persons ever brought to that Bar, and they were *Adam* and *Christ*, where the one was condemned, and the other justified. They were both *Publick Persons*, and as we all were condemned in *Adam*, so are we all freed from that Condemnation by *Christ*, but upon the Terms of the Gospel. We are then, as it were, already passed the Bar of the

Law,

Law, in Christ's suffering in our Place for us, and God will never call him to any more Account. So that what Charge or Accusation soever may be raised thence, they all terron only in those of Children going in the dark, when the Charge alone we are concerned in, is the Charge of Non-performance of the Gospel Condition. I know our Divines are still ready to state the Question between us and the Papists thus: *What is that when the Conscience is wounded under the Sense of Sin, that we can oppose against the Wrath of God, and rest upon for our Peace? Is it our own Righteousness, Works, or Merits, or is it the Satisfaction of Christ?* But this is partial and wide, there is no Man but will answer streight to the Question, and say Christ's Satisfaction. It is true (we all know) none did, or could appease God's Justice. And this we all know too, that we are so far from doing this our selves by our Works or Merits, that Christ hath done it without our doing any thing at all towards it. It was wholly of Free Grace, and there can be no doubt or fear upon the Conscience in regard to that. This is therefore not the Question, but the Satisfaction of Christ and our Redemption by it presupposed, and so a General Pardon preceding Justification already obtained, which being Conditional, the Question only is, whether it be not by performing the Condition that we are justified, to make that Pardon absolutely *Ours*, or to have Christ's Righteousness, or Satisfaction made so, as to that Effect, which can be ours no otherwise, but *Quoad effectum* only. This indeed is the Question between some of Ours and the Papists, the more is the pity, but the Question as to the terrified Christian himself, can be only whether the Condition be performed. If that be so, the Danger is all over. If you will ask further, What we must rest upon, and trust to here in this Case? I say, to the Satisfaction and Merits of Christ upon the Performance. Tho' we trust not our Duty, we must trust on God in Duty, and I have no apprehensive fear about resting in Duty, but this, least we sit down short of Sincerity. It is by the Performance through Christ's Satisfaction the Believer is justified. There is yet this Comfort here, tho' none else in the World, for this alone is worth a World, that we may, must, ought to trust, lean, cast our selves upon the Satisfaction and Merit of Christ, for pardoning all our Failings, and accepting our poor Mite, and if the Soul remains in doubt, it must quiet itself upon him. If with the Pharisee I justifie myself, God may condemn me: If I condemn myself,

with the Publican, he may acquit me. And what must I do in this Case? Behold, O Lord, I am at thy Bar, and I *commit my Cause unto my Judge*. Thy Bar is a Bar, or Throne of *Grace*: I cast myself on thy Grace. And the Lord send me a good Deliverance at the Great Day. As for Actual Pardon and Life that follows Justification, the Merit is to be attributed to that which procured Justification on that Condition. There is nothing of Merit but Christ's throughout. It is Christ's Satisfaction runs through all (I must still say) as the *Meritorious Cause*; when Performance of the Condition becomes thereby the *Formal Cause* of our Justification.

I know how hardly this is like to be received by many, when Dr. *Owen* will allow nothing of any Personal Righteousness, or any Works Legal or Evangelical, but excludes them all from our Justification, supposing that if it be *of Works any way, it is not of Grace at all*, when *it is therefore of Faith* (or upon the Evangelick Condition) *that it may be of Grace*. Dr. *Owen* is a Person whose Name I honour for his Worth, Learning, Comprehensive Parts, and one in whom was more of a Gentleman, as to his Deportment, than in any Divine I knew ever among us: Yet is he more Authorative sometimes in his Book than he needs, which being liable to hurt the humbly Inquisitive, I will speak the more positively in this matter, that the Doctor is out, as I believe, and never came to the plain true knowledge of what *Paul* means by the *Works* he opposes to *Faith* in this Point of Justification: Which Works are such as would justifie a Man in the Apostle's Account if he had them, but that no Man is justified by Works, because he has them not. This I am past doubt is *Paul's* meaning, and in this particular the Learned and Honoured Sir *Charles Wolesley*, before quoted, is rather to be attended. *A Man* (says Sir *Charles*) *that has not a Legal Sinless Perfection, is that* Paul *means by the Ungodly*, Rom. 4. 5. In my first Papers I wrote, I had this Sence of the place, and I have it before, and in my *Pacification* I say the like of that Text. * *Not by the Works of Righteousness we have done*,

* For solving this Matter, *Austin*, and from him the Schools distinguish of *Opera Naturæ*, and *Opera Gratiæ*. We are not saved by Works, or according to Works done in *our own Strength*, but by Works done *by Grace*. But is this the Apostle's meaning? No, I have shewn in my Book of *Just.* that One Thing of Three wherein *Austin* was out, and hath misled the Schools, is this Notion of *Grace*. By *Grace* he understands still this inherent Grace, or Operation of God's Spirit in us, when *Paul* understands it of that *without*, his Favour, or Condescension to us. Not of *Works*, but of *Grace*, is all one, as not of *Desert*, but of *Favour* only. Grace is *Mercy without*, or *contrary to Merit*. Now when the Papist receives the Solution mentioned, the Protestants generally will have all

all Works, tho of the Regenerate, to be but Dung, and Christ's Righteousness alone to save us. But they are both out, for Paul's meaning is quite other than they think, not by Works of Righteousness we have done. The Righteousness which the Jew hath done, is living according to the Law of Nature. The Righteousness which the Gentile hath done, is his living according to the Law of Nature. There is neither one or the other that fulfil that Righteousness which answers God's Law, so as it should be able to save him, and therefore it is of Grace or Mercy that Any are saved. Pacif. p. 29.

but according to his Mercy he saved us: Which Words have put so many to the inventing Distinctions, when the right understanding is to make none, the meaning being only, *Not by the Works of Righteousness we have done*, because we have not done them, and it must be of Mercy therefore, and in another way, we are saved, or not at all. See the Quotation above. The Works then I have said there and here, and must still say, which *Paul* means, are such as would justifie us, such as would make *the Reward of Debt* if we had them, that is perfect Works, *Such* (says the Judicious *Le Blanc*) *as the Law requires to Justification*: And as for that the Doctor hath in answer to this, that *it is a wild Imagination that the perfect Works of the Law will not justifie us, but imperfect Works which answer not the Law will do so*, it does confirm what I judge of the Doctor's Conceptions, that certainly he never understood the Apostle as to this Matter, who (I say) excludes not Works of the Law from Justification, as if they would not justifie us if we had them, but because none have them to be justified by them. It is therefore the *Righteousness of God*, the Righteousness of the Evangelick Condition that he in his Mercy through Christ's Merits hath instituted in the room of *Works*, to justifie the Christian. And as for the Doctor's quoting *Socinus* saying this, to prejudice the Reader against it, I must needs say, I like this excellent Doctor's Judgment the meaner, and seeing I took the Notion from Scripture, and am sure I am no *Socinian* myself, *Socinus* was a Man of Reason, and it is to be lik'd the better for that.

It is a thing (whether so proposed or not) more worth the Thoughts of a serious Man, how the Doctrine of *Justification* as formerly it hath been taught, and is maintained by the Doctor, can be made to lodge with the Doctrine of *Sanctification*, or *Regeneration* in the same Scripture, or be preached together in the same Gospel. The Papists are so careful to have these agree, that they make them one: The Protestants are so careful to keep them asunder that they will not have any Works of ours, not Faith itself as a *Work*, or the Fruits of it Repentance and a Good Life, to be brought into our Justification, least by going to establish our own Righteousness we

we submit not to the Righteousness of God, and perish. *Let the Works be wrought in us* (says the Doctor, *Of Just.* p. 524.) *If they be also wrought by us, I fear their introduction into our Justification doth exclude boasting. This* (he adds) *is a dangerous Point*, even like to make us *lose all the Benefit we might otherwise expect by the Grace of God.* I cannot but remember since I was young, holy Mr. *Shepherd's* Book, *The Sincere Convert*, and do reflect sometimes on that Terror the Reading that, and the like Books, hath wrought in many for fear on one hand least they live short of that universal unreserved Obedience, which is the most general Mark given of Sincerity, and on the other hand, when they have come to be satisfied a little as to that, least they split on the Rock of trusting to themselves, or resting in Duty, instead of the Righteousness of Christ received by Faith only. *All things that are comprised any way in following after Righteousness, such as are all our Duties and Works are excluded from any Influence in our Justification*, says the Doctor, p. 490. And in p. 493, he says, *When the Apostle* James *affirms, that a Man is justified by Works, and not by Faith only, he cannot intend our Justification before God, where it is impossible they should both concur.* I have no doubt but St. *James*, and St. *Paul* both, understood by the Justification they speak of, our Justification *before God*, I have proved it, *Mid. Way of Just.* p. 51, 52. The Justification of *Abraham* before, and at his Offering his Son, argues nothing but that Justification is a continued Act (as a Pardon at Law), and seeing his Faith and Works had Influence in it against the Doctor, I conceive that Faith and Works may be made to concur in Justification more kindly, than Justification and Sanctification can, in their Preaching of the Gospel. The most of the Objections the Doctor tells us, that are raised against his Doctrine, do *arise* (he says) *for want of a due Comprehension of the Order of the Work of Grace, and our Compliance therewithal in a Way of Duty.* I must say the same of him, and as to all that is raised by any against the Doctrine of the *Righteousness of God*, which I am endeavouring to establish against that which is the Doctor's, and the common Protestants Own, instead of *Paul's*, *Revealed* in the Gospel. The Gospel calls for Repentance out of Question, as well as Faith, and the Doctor, and others, could never exclude all Works from Justification against St. *James*, but for want of a *due Comprehending the Way and Method of becoming Righteous*, which God of his Grace and abundant Mercy, (when we were lost and liable to Damnation, through the need of an irrecoverable Innocency)

mercy) hath instituted through Christs Redemption, and the Evangelick Condition, accepted by him instead of the Righteousness of *Works*, from whence we are fallen. This is the *Righteousness of God*, in a short Explanation. I have two Pages to set it out more fuller in my *Mid. Way of Just.* p. 67, 68; and I have two Pages in my *Paneg.* p. 27, 28, 29, 30. which should be read, rather than here abridged.

Well! Let us consult what is that Righteousness of God St. *Paul* speaks of, *Rom.* 1. 17. *Rom.* 3. 21, 22, 26. *Rom.* 10. 3. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Phil.* 3. 9. which he calls so, *God's* Righteousness, the Righteousness of *Faith*, that which is *through the Faith of Christ*, the Righteousness *which is of God by Faith*, in opposition to *Works*, in the Point of Justification? Is it the Righteousness of *Christ*, who is *God*? I am perswaded this is a First Thought, so shallow, that it must be short. What then indeed is it? *This Righteousness of God is that Way and Method of becoming Righteous, which is of God's Institution*, as Another hath expressed it. That is, not the Righteousness *of Christ*, but that Righteousness *through Christ*, which is Ordained of God, and promulgated in the Gospel, to be accepted (I say, through him) unto Justification and Salvation. But what *Way and Method* is that? When God made Man, we must conceive he had in his Prospect what to do with him, and that was to glorifie himself in Saving him. There was two Ways to do this, Either by the Way of *Works*, or *Grace*. Man was Created with an Original Righteousness, and what was *Original* must be *Natural*, and if he had stood, he must, according to *Nature* have been Righteous, and all his Posterity, and the Reward then (as it is reckon'd by the Apostle) would have been of *Debt*, or *Merit*, and not of *Grace*. God hereby should have glorified his *Justice* and *Goodness* in Saving Man, but he should have shewn no *Mercy*, nor Man have any need of it: No, nor any need of a Saviour, or Redemption, or the Holy Spirit's Operation: That is, of that Grace which is Medicinal, or Habitual Grace, for I say, if he had an Original Righteousness, he had no need of the Infusion of a New, to heal Original Corruption. He would have been saved by Works proceeding from Nature, *Ex Regula, & virtute Naturæ*, and not from Grace or the Spirit, and have needed none of that Grace neither which is Favour, but only God's Justice to have dealt with him according to that Law of *Innocency*, which he had performed. God therefore did not choose this Way, that Man should be saved by a Righteousness of his own, according to Nature, but by Way of Grace, and Works proceeding from Grace, or the Holy Spirit, and not of himself, and that is by a Righteousness *which is of God by Faith*. *For by Grace are ye saved through Faith, and not of your selves, lest any Man should boast*: That is, not a Righteousness of your effecting, but of God's own Contrivance, who hath chosen this way rather than that of *Works*, that none may ascribe that to themselves, which is due only to God. *Not by Works of Righteousness which we have done, but according to his Mercy he saved us, by the washing of Water, and renewing of the Holy Ghost*. Note, here is the *Righteousness we have done*, and the *Renewing of the Holy Ghost* so opposed, as that we are saved by that *Righteousness which is of God*, and of God's Spirit, and not by that which is our *Own*. How is that? Why, *They being ignorant of God's Righteousness, and going about to establish their own, have not submitted* to that which should have saved them. The Performance of the Law of *Moses*, was the *Jews* Righteousness (for God says, *This shall be your Righteousness*), and the Performance of the Law of Nature, or Covenant of Works, is all *Mankind's* Righteousness; and when neither *Jew* could perform the One, nor any *Mortal* the Other, there are none can be saved by the Righteousness of their *Own*, but it must be by *Another* Righteousness, called by the Apostle the *Righteousness of God*. *But now the Righteousness of God without the Law is manifest, being witnessed by the Law and Prophets, even the Righteousness of God, which is by the Faith of Jesus Christ*. Here is a Righteousness that was ever on foot in the World (or none else could have been

been saved) but now revealed by the Gospel, which is the Righteousness that saves us, in opposition to the Righteousness of the *Law*, or of *Works*, even the Righteousness of *Faith*, that is a Righteousness according to the Law or Covenant of *Grace*, which Christ hath procured by his Blood. Hence do we read it is said of Christ in *Daniel*, that as he should make *Reconciliation for Iniquity*, so he should *bring* in an *Everlasting Righteousness*, that is, by his Death he should procure a Covenant or Law of Grace, by our Performance whereof (*without the Law*) we are righteous, and must be justified and saved. 'Tis that is *this Righteousness*. If Christ had not procured for us this *New Law*, there could have been no Righteousness in the Earth, for the Law of Innocency no Man can perform, and therefore hath he by procuring this New Covenant, brought in a *Righteousness* in the World, and that which is the abiding Righteousness, the Righteousness of this Covenant, whereby all are saved, that have, or ever shall be saved. Now when we have here a Righteousness which lies in the Performance of the Law of Grace, purchased for us by Christ, and wrought in us by the Spirit of Grace (for the Spirit we must know is not given to perform the Law of *Works*, but this Law) we do see what does belong to this *Way of Grace*, which God hath chosen to save Man by. This Way of Grace does contain in it the giving of Christ, the Redemption we have by him, our Reconciliation with God, Pardon of Sin, the Covenant itself, and the Dispensation of the Spirit, or his Grace for performing the Condition of it. All this, and more, hang together, so that when we say it is not by *Works* but by *Grace*, that we are saved, it is all one as to say, it is not by Perfect Works, but by an Evangelical Righteousness, by Mercy, by Pardon, by Christ. See what this Righteousness of God comes to in its right and full Definition. *Mid. Way of Just.* p. 57, 58.

The Design of God to save Man was to magnifie his Grace, and therefore of two Ways to do it, God chose this of *Grace*, and not the Way of *Works*, unto which yet was Man created, and by which he should have lived if he had stood, and it is *such Works* (which Dr. *Owen* never came to consider) unto which *Grace* is opposed by the Apostle. To this End the Fall is permitted, Redemption by Christ appointed. This Redemption is double, from Sin, and from Condemnation. Christ redeems us from Death by the Sacrifice of himself, upon which an Act of Grace passes, that gives Pardon and Life upon Condition, and the Condition is *Repentance toward God, and Faith toward Jesus Christ*. Redemption from Sin is by the Grace of God's Spirit working in us this Repentance and Faith in order to our Justification, and is called by our Divines *Effectual Vocation*. It is so far therefore from Truth to exclude Evangelical Works from any Interest in our Justification, that they are ordained of God in order to it. God hath linked his Golden Chain, so that *Election* does enter our *Calling*, for Effectual Calling is *Actual* Election; and our *Effectual Calling* does enter our *Justification*, for the Works of it, Faith, Repentance, New Obedience, are imputed to us for that Righteousness that justifies us; and our *Justification*, and inchoate Righteousness does enter and is the *Infancy* of *Glory*.

From

From hence the Justification of a Sinner by the *Righteousness of God* may come under a double Consideration. It may be consider'd *Precisely* in itself, or *Complexly* with its Antecedents, and Consequents. That which is Antecedent to it is *Redemption*, and that from *Damnation* as that from *Sin*, both being wrought without our doing any thing (not so much, says *Rivet*, as to give an *Active Occasion*) towards it, but wholly of Grace. It is like, that in regard to the Antecedents, the Apostle speaks of the *Freeness* of our Justification, so as he does *Rom.* 3. 24. and the like places when otherwise he lets us know, that without Conversion, or a Call of Turning from Sin unto God, no Man can be justified and saved. *Unto whom I send thee to turn them from Darkness to Light, from the Power of Satan unto God, that they may receive Forgiveness of Sins*, Acts 27. 18. There is therefore the *Antecedent*, the *Constituent*, and *Subsequent* of this *Righteousness of God*, and our *Justification* by it. Redemption and Calling are *Antecedents*: The Work of that Calling, which is the Performance of the Condition, and the Imputation of it for Righteousness (the one being as it were the Matter, and the other giving the Form to it) are the *Constituents*: Actual or Absolute *Pardon* and *Life* the *Subsequents*, or Benefits of it. This Distinction I would not omit before I go off, because I would have none so stiff in their own Opinions (much less froward), but that they may yield to others also something in theirs. If *Austin* will place Justification in the Infusion of Grace, I will grant it him as *Antecedent* to it. If Mr. *Wotton* will place it in Pardon, I will grant it him as *Consequent* to it, or as the Special Benefit of it. If the *Assembly* will place it in Pardon, and the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, if they mean it, *Per modum Meriti*, and not *In se*, I will grant it. If Mr. *Baxter* will place it in a Personal Righteousness subservient to the Righteousness of Christ, not formally made Ours, but in the Effects (that is as much as to say, required in order to our having Impunity and Life as Comprehensive of all its Effects or Benefits) I will grant it him, as *Constituent* of it. If Dr. *Owen* will be content, tho' others differ from him, so long as *Remission of Sin, Acceptance with God, Right to Life*, are acknowledged all to be owing to the *Righteousness of Christ, and not the Merit of our Works*, I kiss Dr. *Owen*'s Hand also. Let this Righteousness of God for Justification of Life, be taken in its *Complex* Consideration, and we may all joyn in some Agreement in it, tho' where it is *Precisely* taken, every own will stand for his own Opinion.

Opinion. I was long before I could come to this. God accounting a Man righteous by the Law of Grace, as having performed the Condition I always thought to be Justification; and this Mr. *Baxter* granted me. Pardon then I counted the Effect of this, and therefore different from it, besides that the Word me thoughts would not allow them to be the same. *Pardon of Sin is not signified by the Word Justification in any place of Scripture*, says Dr. *Owen*, p. 173. *The Word is never found so used, either in the* Hebrew *or* Greek *Writers, Sacred or Profane, nor in our common Speech*, says *Gataker* (on *Isa.* 5. 23), who was in this yet a more competent Judge. How these two Things being different, as the Cause and Effect, should enter the same Definition, and be made one, I could not devise or admit, 'till I was taught by one Word in a Letter I receiv'd from Mr. *Baxter*. *Pardon* (says he) *is not that Justification*. The Word [*That*] instructed me, that *Justification* being a Forensical Term opposed to *Accusation*, According to the *Accusation*, such he counted *Justification*. There are now two Charges (as most say) against the Sinner, a Charge of the *Law*, and a Charge of the *Gospel*. The Charge of the Law is, that we have broke it, and are liable to the *Curse*, Gal. 3. 10. Our Justification against this Charge, is by an Acknowledgment of the Indictment, but we plead a Statute made in the Year of our Lord Christ's Death, when and where it is Enacted, That whosoever believes and repents, shall be freed from that Condemnation. That is, Our Plea in short is, a Pardon upon Christ's Satisfaction. But this Pardon being General and Conditional, there arises the Charge of the Gospel. This Charge is that we have not performed the Condition, And our Justification against this Charge, is by pleading *Not Guilty*, for the Performance of the Evangelick Condition (accepted through Mercy and Christ's Merits, is our Righteousness, as Not Guilty (which is shewn before) of this Charge of Non-performance. Here *De Re*, I agree with Mr. *Baxter*, but *De Nomine*, I am not satisfied yet, to allow any other than one Justification. Our Justification at Judgment, *Come ye blessed, for when I was hungry ye fed me*, is plainly the Evangelick Condition performed, and that is the Righteousness according to which the Sentence passes, and as is the Justification of the *Judge*, such must be that of the present *Law*, whereby he judges, and that is therefore our *Evangelical* Justification. As for the Charge of the *Law*, I count it can have no place at the Judgement of God, for the Satisfaction of Christ,

Christ, and the Pardon upon it cannot there be brought in question. If a Charge may be supposed, the Satisfaction of Christ, which is our Plea against it, is not Ours, or imputed to us for Ours, not imputed *in se* (I and Mr. *Baxter* hold) and so cannot be here our *Formal Righteousness*, without which a *Legal* Justification thereby arises not. Besides this, the Pardon granted upon Christ's Satisfaction, is that *Universal Conditional Remission* which precedes Justification, and when it comes to be *Absolute* or *Actual* to any one, it is the Consequent of his Justification, and must not be Justification itself, as some make it. I am not willing therefore to apprehend, that because here are two Righteousnesses, there are two Justifications, for Christ's Righteousness, as the Meritorious Cause of it goes into that *Evangelical* one, and makes not Another: But I would have one only Justification, yet set forth in Scripture, and spoken of by Divines under a *double* Consideration, as *Strictly* and *Largely* taken. Under a *Strict* and *Precise* Consideration, I suppose nothing but what goes into the *Form* of it, may be said of it: Under a *Large* and *Complex* Consideration, I allow the thing and benefit, tho' *Cause* and *Effect* (which was my heretofore Scruple) may be comprized in our speaking of one and the same Justification. I will press this Difficulty no further, nor move any other, but will break off with that Resolution I take up from *Chemnicius*, and he, by the Stile, I suppose, from *Luther*. *Quæ dialectica subtilitate dissolvi non possunt, piscatoria simplicitate præcidantur.* And as to these aforesaid Charges or Accusations, I say this only, that let as many be raised, as any can raise, they need not every one a *Particular*, but are all discharg'd by one *Universal Evangelical Justification*.

FINIS.

COROLLARIUM.

IN the Year 1684, I wrote four or five Sheets entituled, *Two Steps* toward obtaining my Liberty of Preaching, and a *Third Step* after, but both at that time without effect. I will ſuppoſe a Man Epiſcopally Ordained, and one that holds Communion with the Church. Such a Man yet cannot have a *Living*, or a *Lecture* (we know) without his *Declaration of Aſſent and Conſent*, and his *Subſcription according to the Canons*, with Conforming in all Things beſide: But there is nothing to hinder him the Preaching an *Occaſional Sermon* (Prayers being duly read) in any Church, only the want of a *Licenſe to Preach*. Unto ſuch a *Licenſe* in the *Act of Uniformity*, is required his Reading the Thirty Nine Articles, and Aſſent to them, before the Biſhop, and nothing elſe. A *Canon* need not be urged, it were unmerciful, when an *Act* connives. The *Act* indeed, as well as *Canons*, requires more to the Preaching as a *Lecturer*, or *Beneficed* Man; but no more to a *Licenſe to Preach*. The Uniformity Act requiring this, is bound up with the *Common Prayer*, and is made part of that Book. In the Preface hereof, there is a Clauſe to this Sence, That *if any Doubts ſhall ariſe about the Underſtanding any Matter contained in the Book, the Perſon ſhall reſort to the Biſhop, or Archbiſhop, and he ſhall reſolve the ſame.* That the Articles are of various and doubtful Interpretation, it is apparent by the Miniſters of diverſe Judgments, ſome *Arminians*, ſome *Calviniſts*, ſubſcribing them, and that with Allowance of the *Church*. If then ſuch a Man (as before qualified) ſhall make, or ſet down, his own Conſtruction of every ſuch Article as he ſcruples, and then in his reading the Article, read alſo his Sence of it, and it be ſuch as the Biſhop allows to be Orthodox, a Licenſe upon this Account, *Salva Conſcientia*, may be had. I cannot give an *unfeigned Aſſent* to theſe Articles, all, without a Liberty of Explication, but with one, I may: And upon that Suppoſition there is the *Eleventh* Article, Entituled, *Of the Juſtification of Man*, which concerns me, in regard to this preſent Book.

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, by Faith, and not for our own Works or Deſervings: Wherefore that we are juſtified by Faith only, is a wholeſome Doctrine, and very full of Comfort, as is more largely expreſſed in the Homily of Juſtification. Art. 11.

By the Words [*Faith only*] I underſtand what *Paul* means by [*Faith without Works*], that is, *Faith* in oppoſition to *Works*, that would make the Reward to be of *Debt*, and not of *Grace*; or to the *Works* of the *Law*, Works which the Law requires to Juſtification (which none have, and if any be juſtified at all, it muſt be therefore *without them*), not in oppoſition to Repentance and Evangelical Obedience: And though it be for Chriſt's ſake, or his Merits, not Ours, that he accounts us righteous, yet is our Faith, Repentance, and ſincere Obedience, the Condition upon which he does it, or rather *the Righteouſneſs itſelf*, which upon the Account of Chriſt's Deſervings he accepts unto Life everlaſting. *So I have it in theſe mentioned Sheets.*

J. H.

ERRATA.

Page 9. l. 28. for *Firſt*, r. *Fifth*. p. 11. 21. for *Meritory*, r. *Meritorid*. p. 14. l. 34. for *its*, r. *it*, with a Full-point. p. 15. l. 32. for *Sated*, r. *Stated*. p. 18. l. 26. in the Margin for *thus*, r. *by which*. p. 31. l. 32. for *rearum* r. *reatum*. p. 27. l. 2. for *Cauſe*, r. *Cauſa*.

An ADVERTISEMENT *from the* Bookſeller.

There are ſeveral Papers of Four or Five Sheets apiece, written formerly by this Author, called, *The Middle Way*, of Election, of Redemption, of Juſtification, of the Covenants, Law and Goſpel, of Perfection: As alſo *Peaceable Diſquiſitions*, which Treat, Of the Natural, and Spiritual Man, of Praying by the Spirit, of Preaching by Demonſtration of it, of Aſſurance, of the *Arminian* Grace, of the Poſſibility of Heathens Salvation, of the Reconciliation of *Paul* and *James*, of the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, with other Incidental Matters: One of which Middle Papers, that of *Juſtification*, was Reprinted two Years ſince, with the Quotation of what concerns that Subject, out of the other, and ſince that *One Sheet* (ſo called), and his Six Sheets laſt Year, called, *Pacification*. All which may be bound up together with this preſent *Diſcourſe*, for any that deſires them.

In that Book called *Pacification*, there is the *Caſe of Non-Reſiſtance and Paſſive-Obedience* Stated and Reſolved, the Doctrine whereof *Abjured* in the two former Reigns, is here in this King's Reign Recorded for a *Memoriæ Sacrum*, to thoſe which are to come.

Whoſoever hath thoſe Six Sheets, they are deſired in *Page* 35. *Line* 20. to put in the word [not], which the *Printer* hath left out, to the contradicting the Scope of the Book.

T. P.